



**SCOTTSDALE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
KIVA - CITY HALL
3939 N. DRINKWATER BOULEVARD
NOVEMBER 17, 2005
APPROVED REGULAR SESSION MINUTES**

PRESENT: Kevin Osterman, Council Member
E.L. Cortez, Vice-Chairman
Steve Steinberg, Commission Member (departed at 4:06 p.m.)
Michael D'Andrea, Design Member
Kevin O'Neill, Design Member
Michael Schmitt, Design Member
Jeremy A. Jones, Design Member

STAFF: Donna Bronski
Tim Connor
Mac Cummins
Tim Curtis
Lusia Galav
Ed Gawf
Sherry Scott

CALL TO ORDER

The regular session of the Scottsdale Development Review Board was called to order by Councilman Osterman at 1:05 p.m.

ROLL CALL

A formal roll call confirmed members present as stated above.

OPENING STATEMENT

Councilman Osterman read the opening statement that describes the role of the Development Review Board and the procedures used in conducting this meeting.

MINUTE APPROVAL

November 3, 2005 DRB Study Session Minutes
November 3, 2005 DRB Regular Meeting Minutes

APPROVED 12/01/2005 - bdf

VICE-CHAIRMAN CORTEZ MOVED TO APPROVE THE NOVEMBER 3, 2005 MEETING MINUTES. SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER JONES, THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).

CONSENT AGENDA

3. 28-DR-2000#4 Portales Residential
Modification of Site Plan & Elevations
5000 N Portales Place
V V G Associates LLC, Architect/Designer

Ms. Galav noted receipt of a card indicating that a citizen wished to address the Board regarding this project.

Board Member O'Neill requested clarification of the citizen's position. Larry Felder, 7120 E. Pasadena, addressed the Board, expressing favor for completion of the project but noted concerns regarding traffic flow and requested that cut-through traffic is controlled through the site.

Ms. Galav informed the Board that staff and the Applicant are currently working on a resolution with regard to the traffic and a stipulation is being devised. She further noted that the issue must be resolved in order for the project to move forward from the building perspective.

Upon inquiry by Councilman Osterman, the consensus of the Board is that the item remain on the consent agenda.

NOTE: Patty Badenoch, 5027 N 71st Place, submitted a speaker card. She declined the opportunity to speak, but requested that the following comments be included in the record:

Traffic is a concern to our neighborhood in Camelback Park Estates. Traffic controls are imperative! This plan can not go forward without neighborhood approval.

VICE-CHAIRMAN CORTEZ MOVED THAT CASES 39-DR-2005, 79-DR-2005 AND 92-DR-2003#2 BE MOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA TO THE REGULAR AGENDA. SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER D'ANDREA, THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).

VICE-CHAIRMAN CORTEZ MOVED THAT CASES 17-PP-2005 AND 78-DR-2005 BE MOVED FROM THE REGULAR AGENDA TO THE CONSENT AGENDA. SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER JONES, THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).

4. 13-PP-2005 Scottsdale Estates
Preliminary Plat
NEC of Cactus Road & 90th Street
Brooks Engineering, Engineers

5. 38-DR-2005 Arizona School of Real Estate Colors/Parking Lot
Color Changes/Parking Lot Modifications
7125 E. 2nd Street
Tom Denny Architecture, Architect/Designers
7. 66 DR-2005 J W Harris Building Remodel/Addition
Site Plan & Elevations
3944 N. Marshall Way
Kendle Design Collaborative, Architect/Designer
9. 86-DR-2005 Dr. Vander Schaaf & Douglas Beischel
Remodel Site Plan & Elevations
7342 E. Thomas Road
Fifer Design Studio, Architect/Designer
12. 17-PP-2005 Canyon Residences @ Silverleaf
Preliminary Plat
East of Thompson Peak Parkway and Union Hills Drive
H & S International, Architect/Designer
13. 78-DR-2005 Canyon Residences @ Silverleaf
Site Plan, Elevations, Landscape
East of Thompson Peak Parkway and Union Hills Drive
H & S International, Architect/Designer

VICE-CHAIRMAN CORTEZ MOVED FOR THE APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA: 28-DR-2000#4; 13-PP-2005; 38-DR-2005; 66-DR-2005; 86-DR-2005; 17-PP-2005 AND 78-DR-2005. SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER JONES, THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).

REGULAR AGENDA

11. 88-DR-2005 ASU-Scottsdale Center for New Technology and Innovation
DRB Recommendation
SEC McDowell & Scottsdale Roads
Pei Cobb Freed & Partners, Architect/Designer

[BEGIN VERBATIM RECORD]

ED GAWF: Thank you, Councilman Osterman and Board Members. I'm Ed Gawf, Assistant City Manager for the City of Scottsdale. And as you know, I have been working on the revitalization program for the southern part of the City and I've also been working on the ASU/Scottsdale project. And I'm pleased to be here today.

What I'm going to do is give a brief introduction, background and history of this. And I will work to keep it brief. There's a lot of history and background, but I know that you know that. You know the background, but I want to set is the context for this. We will do a little different kind of process after that. I have requested that the Applicant proceed, following my presentation, and really go through the project.

Tom Samuels, who is with the Higgins Corporation will speak for the Applicant. His architect and development team are here. And then have them go through and explain the project in great detail, because this is a major good project for the City of Scottsdale and deserves that kind of focus and attention. And after that presentation, I will ask Mac Cummins, who is the Project Coordinator, to wrap up with our analysis and recommendation, if you will.

The site is one that we've talked about quite a few times over the last couple of years. It's the 42-acre site that is located at McDowell -- and Brian, if you could follow my comments on this -- on McDowell and Scottsdale Road, as shown here. And the surrounding area is residential.

McDowell and Scottsdale Road are typical of the old retail commercial street that existed, that developed in the 50's and 60's. From 1969 through the mid-90's, Los Arcos Mall was the use of this site. It was a regional mall. As I understand it, the first regional mall in the Phoenix area. In the mid-90's it closed. It was torn down and it has been a vacant site since that time.

A little over a year ago, a year ago August -- July and August, the City acquired the 42-acres. We acquired the entire parcel and then entered into a lease for 37-acres with ASUF: Arizona State University Foundation. And the leases are long-term; they are 99 years with a 99-year option, so we're partners with them throughout this period of time.

In November of last year the City Council appointed an Ad Hoc Working Group to prepare guidelines. It was really an effort to bring the Community in at the beginning, even before development plans had been prepared, to put together our Community expectations. And we met and had charades, open houses, focus groups for about six months. And in March and April of this year, the Ad Hoc report was completed, and then in June of this year, the City Council approved the zoning. And I'll talk about the Ad Hoc report and this zoning as we go forward.

If I can go to the next slide. The Ad Hoc Citizens Advisory Group is an eleven member working group who looked at this issue as I said, over a five/six month period. And the report which you previously received is probably 50 or 60 pages. The key of that is the Ad Hoc Advisory Group felt it was very important to really focus on what are the key guiding principals of redevelopment of this 42-acres and the surrounding area. As you may recall, the focus of the group is not only to make recommendations on the old Los Arcos site, the 42-acres, but also revitalization of the Scottsdale Road and McDowell Road corridors. And this has a broader application, if you will, than just the property that we're talking about today. But I think the principals stay the same.

The first is to create a balance of land uses and relationships between parcels, encourage meaningful open space and public uses. And I'll talk about these as I go through, and I'm sure the Applicant will also include these in their presentation.

Facilitate mobility and connections. And that was a very important aspect.

Demonstrate Scottsdale commitment to quality. Quality both in buildings. Quality in site planning. Quality in the type of uses that are attracted here.

Environmental sustainability was another point. And then finally, and this was a key point: Use this as a leverage to revitalize the southern part of the Community.

As we've talked about previously, it is a working principal almost; a fundamental principal in the Phoenix area that we have disposable neighborhoods and disposable streets. The older neighborhoods that were good neighborhoods in the 50's, and 60's and 70's, now are a little bit down the hills. The old commercial streets: the Washington's Van Buren's et cetera, that were the prime commercial arteries of the 50's, 60's and 70's now are in need of revitalization. So this is a new effort that we're doing in Scottsdale and this was an important part of whatever we do with the 42-acres, and the corridor of Scottsdale Road and McDowell being used as the leverage to revitalize the entire 13-square miles south of Indian Bend Road.

This shows you the 42-acres and the green or A is the land leased by ASU-F and then B-1 and B-2 are the two parcels totaling five acres that the City retained. As I said, the City Council rezoned the property in June of this year. They zoned it Planned Community (PCD): Planned Community District.

The Planned Community zoning allows a variety of uses. And you may recall that we tailored the uses to be specific to this project. There are several uses that are allowed in commercial zones that we do not allow here. But what we do allow are research and development uses, office use, retail, residential and service related. So we're allowing -- we're trying to create a use of mixes: retail, office, research, residential, in this area.

And again, the thought was it wasn't just the 42-acres, but it's the larger area including the Los Arcos Crossings, the Culver Avenue lands, over to Miller Road. And part of the zoning approval was adherence to the guiding principals, the guidelines and then the frame work plan that incorporated this that was submitted by the Applicant, and approved and incorporated as part of the zoning.

The PC District stands -- let me just go through it now, what the PC District really is. As I said, we limited the uses there. Secondly we created development standards that apply to the 42-acres. The height is a maximum of 60-feet for buildings. We did provide a provision for lower heights as it approaches the residential, especially to the south of the property. We also looked at the idea of for special features, it could go over 60-feet, but the floor area ratio is .8. And it was intended to be, again, one where 60-foot of height, it could go over that for special monuments, but it was one that was tailored specifically for this development.

In addition to that, we identified open space for the site: 20 percent or more of the site needed to be open space; public open space. And that was accomplished through pedestrian and landscaped areas along all of the major corridors. It was included within the east/west pedestrian spine. And it was also included within plazas that would line the west side of the property at Scottsdale Road and the boulevard at the Papago traffic light, but also on 74th and the boulevard.

We also required a building step-back, especially along the major roads. And we identified the parking that was required for this particular project.

In addition to that we, as you might not be surprised, we applied a series of stipulations to this project. Or conditions. I call them conditions. But they were intended to achieve

the guidelines as established or identified by the Ad Hoc Working Committee. As you know, guidelines are just that: they are ideas through guidelines. In order to make them really effective, to use as a regulatory tool, you have to take those guidelines, take them out of that document and put them into the zoning code that is adopted for the property. And that's really what the conditions of approval are. One of them is that one and a-quarter acre in the area be public gathering space. And as I indicated, there's two of those on the site: one on the west and one on the east side.

Secondly, Scottsdale Road and McDowell Road landscaping improvements need to be done with the first building. And as you'll see today, approximately 90 to 95 percent of all of the open space is intended to be improved with the first phase.

Parking structures shall be screened from Scottsdale Road and McDowell and 74th. So if the buildings front the parking structures, the parking structures fade into the background, if you will.

And then finally, all non-residential development shall conform to LEED certified standards. And I'll talk about that in a second.

This shows you the development framework plan that was approved -- recommended for approval by the DRB and approved by the City Council in June of this year. You can see by the different colors, and Brian if you'll follow me on this it would be helpful. The first is the building envelope: that is shown in the pink color on this, that frames the parking structures that are identified by the blue color there. The major access to this is the two roads of east/west north/south road.

The east/west road is intended to be a pedestrian boulevard. It's 100-feet from building to building. You may recall this: that the sidewalks are 15 to 18-feet wide, angled parking, enough room in there for two-way traffic, but also enough room that if in the future we did some type of street car kind of access to this site, there's room there for that. So it is designed to be wide enough for a good pedestrian feel, but not so wide that you lose that intimacy that's necessary for pedestrianization.

It also identified corners that were important. The corner of Scottsdale Road and McDowell that's shown there, was a very important corner. And how that's treated will be determined by the Applicant's proposal in the future and the DRB consideration of this.

The other important intersection or corner is Scottsdale Road and the Papago traffic light, as shown there. The entry into it, and there's a couple of ways to look at it. We looked at both approaches. One is to have it diagonal, coming in from the intersection. The other is to really emphasize the boulevard going east/west. And the thought was to really create a functional pedestrian boulevard, this east/west connection serves it the best. And I'll show you also how it provides connections with adjacent properties.

Then we also had the landscaping that is shown in the plan, that is adjacent to the parking structures and on the perimeter of all of the property, adjacent to all of the streets. Part of this effort also had the two plazas that I mentioned: the one on the west, and this is intended to be more of the public sort of domain. The public plaza, public gathering space. We're looking at some where in there putting a mini city hall or transit center there, really becoming a focal point for the Community at that point.

The other one, on the east side, is more of a neighborhood or community gathering space. And you may recall that the street, the boulevard street, is designed in such a way that it can be closed off and used for major events. And so the whole boulevard in effect, and especially the east half, can serve as a very significant public gathering space.

So again, we have the 42-acres that was zoned here that is very important. But let me go through -- now, this is an innovation center. This is intended to be the home, if you will, for creativity, for innovative thoughts. And trying to program innovation is always difficult. Now we all know the story of Hewlett Packard that started in the garage. Working in Palo Alto -- SYSCO Systems and Apple started in a garage. I know other high tech firms that started in second floor retail space. So creativity, innovation really comes from the people who work there. That is the most important factor.

But there are things that we can do to make this innovative and to make this more capable of drawing the kind of employee and firms and uses that we want. And with some of the things we're doing, I'm sure they'll talk about this in much more detail as part of the Applicant's presentation, but some of the things that we did as part of the zoning to try to build this space, was first-floor retail. Very significant. I mean when I go to the Perimeter Center and see an office park, I see a pizza shop down at the end of the block. But there's no first floor -- these are office buildings. First floor retail is very important and I think I've used the analogy before of again in Palo Alto, that a lot of the new high tech firms when they were starting wanted to be in downtown Palo Alto where they could walk down from the second floor to the first floor main street and get a cup of coffee and talk to other workers in the high tech field. So first floor retail is very important.

Having something dramatic was very important. The Skysong. Something that makes this site different than other sites. And the story I tell is: as a Planner, I see things that are not there. And I understand some people are committed when they see that, but I go to the site and I see the framework plan, I see buildings, I see landscaping, I see the streets end. When others go to the site, they see Los Arcos Crossing that has an old Osco store that's abandoned; that the shopping center is in dire need of removal and revitalization, redevelopment. They see housing in some areas that are not as good. They see check cashing. They see what's there today. Not what will be there five years from now. So something dramatic. We knew that as part of the Ad Hoc Group report. We also knew it as part of the zoning, that something dramatic had to draw attention to this spot because the competition is not Miller and McDowell. The competition is Tempe Town Lake, Perimeter Center Pavilions, Promenade Indian Lands. That's the competition.

A center boulevard, pedestrian orientation, trying to make this again special, that makes it different than an office park. The transit center, I think very important as you know that we have received a \$2 million dollar federal grant that we're adding with a million and a-half dollars of City money to build a transit center right there at McDowell and Scottsdale Road. And in that transit center we're looking at doing a mini City Hall that would have a citizen service center, meeting space, that will have even a reading library there. A place where the Community can come and gather at that place and be able to use the services of the City.

Plazas and public open spaces, I've talked about before. What you'll see today is they felt that was such an important aspect of that project, that they added plaza space right at the center point. And I think that's a great addition.

Transportation demand management. When you talk about environmental aspects of this, we wanted to be really at the cutting edge of environmental issues. Part of it is the LEED certified that you see below: LEED certified. This is probably the only major project of this size in the State of Arizona: 1.2 million square feet, that is committed to LEED certification. Of being certifiable from a LEED standpoint.

And we met with -- the developer has met with the staff and with EQAB Board, or at least Rob Sandys (phonetic) from the EQAB Board and started to go over what aspects of LEED will be in this project. But one of the things that I saw was that every category of LEED points were being addressed in this project. And 26 points of the basic for the LEED I think, I feel confident at least, that that will be achieved. I think there may be even more points than that because it's part of creativity and economic feasibility that can go hand-in-hand and we're exploring different ways for that.

But going back to the TDM, I think it's very important that probably the major energy use of any project is going to and from the project is the car and the energy/gasoline used for that. And so what we've required as part of the zoning is that with the first building and buildings after that, that the Applicant put together a transportation demand management program showing the different ways in which they are going to work to reduce automobile traffic to this site. And that is significant.

And then finally the connection to other properties. And clearly it's part of the regional area, but it's also very important to connect to the adjacent properties, as you can see from this drawing. I think it's supposed to move Brian. Well, best laid plans of mice and men. Can you go back to that and try it, Brian? Because it's an important point, not that the rest of it -- the other comments I made were important, but this is important. [Laughter].

This shows the region. And if we can hone in, what this was trying to show is the connection of this site with adjacent properties. One of the things that was very important with the Ad Hoc Committee, with City Council, with the zoning and approval, was that this project is not an Arizona Center. Arizona Center, that's actually a great project, but it turns its back to downtown Phoenix. This project, we insisted, has to reach out to the neighborhood, even if the neighborhood is, right now at least, may not be as nice you want, it has to reach out. And so part of the plan is to take the 42-acres that you see in color, continue the boulevard on to Miller and really prompt the revitalization of Los Arcos Crossings and the property along Culver. And that is in the works. Right now there is an option for someone to purchase the Crossing property. And why is that occurring? It's only occurring because of the commitment that we've made to ASU/Scottsdale, the plans that Higgins has presented to us, and the excitement about the continuation of the boulevard, that really makes the Crossings a viable project. And revitalization of the Crossings a viable project.

So with that, just quickly, our process: This is a process that we've used before on the waterfront. This is one where we're bring the first two phases to you for recommendation. It will go to the City Council for approval. We're looking right now at December 13th. So today we're asking you to look at Phase I and Phase II and Skysong

and then we will take it to the Planning Commission for a recommendation on the height of Sky Song. And the Applicant and Mac will go over the dimensions of that, but it is over the 60 feet. And then the City Council will hear that.

In future phases the DRB will be the final decision maker with potential for call-out from that. But we wanted to start this on the right foot.

The other thing I would say is that we've had a couple of goals in this project for the last year. And I see Duke Ryder (phonetic) in the room and he is the one that asked this question a year ago actually about, as I talk about: We need to do this now, not five years from now. And he asked me the question of: But we have to do it right. And I said: Yes, we do. This is important. We have to do it right. That doesn't mean we can't meet it -- do it on a good schedule. And we are. We're looking at site preparation in January. Construction starting on the building, the first building, Phase I in March/April; in that time frame. So again, with that, let me turn it over to the Applicant Tom Samuels for his presentation. And then Mac Cummins will make some comments and then I'll conclude. Thank you.

TOM SAMUELS: I'm Tom Samuels. I'm the partner in charge of this project, from Higgins Development Partners. And I am here today representing our partners: The Plaza Companies, ASU-F and really in large part, the Community, because the City is a true partner in this public/private partnership as well.

I am going to talk briefly about the overriding development strategy that really informed the design and take you through how we got to where we are today. And then I'm going to ask Georgia Asarcon (phonetic) who is our architect from Pei Cobb Freed to talk about some of the specifics of the building design going forward.

I would like to start this by emphasizing one very important aspect of the project, and that is that today, although we are going to present the large strategic overview and we are going to present an idea of what the ultimate site plan for this project will be, we are here today asking for your positive recommendation on the first two buildings that we are going to build for this project.

The buildings are 150,000 square feet a piece or about 300,000 square feet together. That is about ten percent of 1.2 million. The first building is about ten percent of the space that we will ultimately be building and it is our intention that all of the buildings that get built on this site will be different; will be their own building for their own purpose. And we will be coming back to you with the subsequent buildings, for your input, for your approval and for your support.

And so today we're focusing on some very important buildings and some certainly very important site planning issues, but by no means the last word on where the design for this project will ultimately be.

So let me see if I can make this work. Okay. I'd like to pick up on a few of the topics that Ed talked about because they were the underlying strategy that lead us to be where we are. And those were, first of all, the guiding principals that were set by the public and the public process that also informed this design. And Ed ran through this, of course, the first up there was creating a balance of land use and land use relationships and really the important aspect of this is that it will truly be a mixed use development and will

be a mixed use development at each stage. So the first phase development includes both research, office research and retail. And all of the surrounding landscape for the project. And that we felt was an important thing rather than leave the mixed use aspect of this project to develop at the end.

The second goal was to encourage meaningful open space and public use. And I go back to the very first meetings we held with the City of Scottsdale and what the Community was saying back. At the time that Los Arcos Mall occupied this site, there was a community space that Los Arcos Mall offered the community around it. And the larger community as well. And when Los Arcos Mall disappeared, that community space was lost. And so we began this process with the idea that we needed to create a viable public realm; a community space that people would go to. Not just go to for special events, but be able to go to all of the time.

And so one of Harry Cobb's underlying feelings was that if we could create a boulevard that was a mix of offices and shops and restaurants, but make it a place that people would go. And more importantly, a place that people would be excited about going and comfortable about going. I remember the Mayor making the comment early on that it should be a place where somebody would feel comfortable pushing a baby carriage. This idea of giving back to the Community a public realm that was a 7 by 24 public realm that people could go to and use, was fundamental in the over encompassing urban design of the project. And from that, came the idea that that open space, that meaningful open space, could itself be the icon. It could be the symbol of this project. And if you could make it, if you could do the one broad stroke of making that open space so exciting, so memorable and such an image that the whole project identified around it, you would be a long way to making this purr and is how this Skysong shade structure evolved: as a piece of the puzzle to create an icon for this project to tie it to the public realm, visually, esthetically, functionally and so you see the buildings as a backdrop to that image for the project.

The next two: facilitating mobility and interconnectivity has been talked about. I think it is very important to stress the point that we are part of a bigger puzzle that this idea of the grand east/west boulevard will ultimately, if it is successful and we feel that it will be, will be something that enables, just as Ed pointed out, that the Los Arcos Crossing will be developed. The idea of wanting the circulator down through this area of providing bike paths and all of the rest, all of this came together trying to reinforce the interconnectivity of the site.

The demonstration to quality, the landmark provisions of this site and all of the rest, are now what this meeting is really all about. What are the qualities of the buildings? What is the quality of the landscape? And I think we'll be able, as we go through this, to demonstrate that all of that is true.

A lot of talk about sustainability. There's been a lot of talk about sustainability. We have a sustainability plan. We've demonstrated that we will be able to be certifiable. We're happy to talk about that plan, but when the architects and engineers and we from the development team got together, we said that the important thing about this LEED certification, this LEED certifiable project, was that we were going to be the first and the biggest demonstration that this could actually be accomplished. And if we set for ourselves a goal of touching all of the individual LEED categories, and you're probably familiar with the point system and the fact that there are different categories where you

can get points, our idea, our strategy, was to demonstrate in each of those categories, how you could do this and how you could get those points. And I believe that our strategy will in-fact do all of that.

And lastly, promoting social and economic vitality. Again, the idea that we are creating a place, a sense of place. And as we get to it and Georgia presents the rest of this project, I think we'll demonstrate to you that we will create a place, and in creating that place, we will in-fact be promoting social and economic vitality for the area.

The connection to Indian Bend Wash. We talked about that. Fundamental to the project.

The framework plan. This was a new approach to what is a very large project. Ed has described this; I'm not going to go back through it. But I do want to say, you'll see as we go through this that our project, the project that we are bringing to you today, is in complete conformity with the plan. It works.

What I'm putting up here now are the three major open spaces that we've talked about so far. A .42-acre open space on the east. A .83 open space, I should say .83 on the east, a .4 on the west and the boulevard itself. Now, this was the concept when the project began. And the boulevard was to be an active 24 by 7 kind of place where people could come and go. The open space on the west of the project was to be institutional in nature for smaller gatherings and the .83-acre open space, which is yet to be programmed, was a public open space for larger gatherings, which could be integrated into the boulevard itself, which can closed off.

As the project proceeded in its plan, we came to the conclusion that the project needed to have a third open space.

COUNCILMAN OSTERMAN: Sir, you can use that hand-held microphone there if a --

MR. SAMUELS: If you created an open space, a plaza, a place for performances and large scale gatherings could happen at one end, and you anchored the boulevard with that, and you created this active boulevard space in the middle, and you anchored it on the other end with a kind of a more institutional open space to create the entry and the sequence of coming into the site, that really it opened up a third kind of open space that we had not talked about in the beginning of the zoning discussion. And that was the idea that we would create the commercial center of the site. And the idea being that this commercial center would be an ideal place for restaurants and gatherings and things like that. And the service sorts of retail things would grow out from that so there would be a true commercial heart to the site. And that is the sort of center piece to the site.

This is what I was addressing before: this is simply an overlay of the first part of our -- the first phase of our building, which is right here. And it's a little bit difficult to see from there, but what this is is a demonstration that that first phase is in complete accordance with the zoning framework for the site.

Lastly, I would like to just point out, and then I'm going to turn this over to Georgia to talk about the architecture and the landscaping. This is the image of what Phase I and Phase II will be when it's complete. The landscaping will be done completely

surrounding the site. The boulevard will be in place. Our Skysong development will be between the two buildings and all of the other landscape that you see will be there.

And the question has been raised: Why would you not put the buildings over here? And from a site planning and a strategic development plan, that is a logical question to ask. And I would address it by saying this: We believe in the future of this site. We believe that all of the site will be developed. And by staking out this part of it, and by building the central square, we are creating a foreground to the site that will enable these two sites to be developed after that. And if you imagine these buildings being built first, the idea that something was happening behind them, would be very difficult for people to envision. Once this is in place, the forecourt, the foreground is a place that becomes really important and a desirable anchor. So, Georgia.

GEORGIA ASARCON: Thanks Tom. Is this working? Can you hear me? First of all, I would just like to say how really delighted I am to be here today on behalf of Pei Cobb Freed and Partners. And to be extremely busy and productive five months since we've had the rezoning approved. And I'm very pleased to be able to show you what our current thinking is and what we anticipate the physical ramifications will be on this very, very important site.

Just very briefly going to run through the first and second phases. As Tom has already mentioned, we have been very mindful of the six guiding principals and the vision established by the Ad Hoc Working Group. And also our so called rules of the road, specifically the link to Indian Bend Wash and the basic overall design principles for the site.

So in this diagram you see the first and second phases of the project, mainly the first building which is 157,000 square feet and the blue represents office and research components and the red is a retail edge to the building which lines the boulevard and gives it life and the vitality that we are really searching for.

Behind each of these buildings is a temporary parking lot which would accommodate the required number of parking spaces; 1 per 300 gross square feet. And of course these are temporary. Once the full project is built out, these will be supplemented or replaced by structured parking lots.

Now, very important to the thinking, as we've all heard, is the structuring of the open space and how that open space contributes ultimately to the form that the buildings take. As you see here in this diagram, we've conceptualized it as four very specific and distinct types of open spaces. Firstly, space number one, the one on the western side of the boulevard which is in a way the gateway to the site. It will be built during the first phase, and that will accommodate the future building which we envision as a potential institute building, an iconic building, which could give an identify to this place. But in the interim it will be a very useful and very public open gathering space, which could also be linked to the transit center.

Secondly, what we call number two here on the drawing is the central open plaza, which is really -- will be ultimately an accumulation of four separate smaller plazas, which link and become one space. And I'll go into more detail on that later.

And then thirdly, the boulevard itself, which is the people's place. The promenade. The place where you walk and where you can look into retail stores and so on. Now, these three open spaces are really what structure the project. The forms of the buildings are quiet. They respond to market forces. They are responsive to the dictates of what the market can pay and leases and practical requirements for office and research, but at the same time we feel that they really do mold and shape the urban environment and the space in between. And that's really where our focus has been.

So in this view you see one of the plazas. I'm sorry it's partially hidden by the model but you see the distinctive blue color which shapes that urban room and the retail protruding out of the lower level in the red sandstone color at the base. And the way the landscape has been articulated with the taller palms and the water wall in the background, which will give this place a very unique, we feel, identity, with the sound of the water as a backdrop.

The view looking down from the third floor level of the building, getting a sense of what the Boulevard space would be and the lowering of the space from the road to terraces which will be very active and alive spaces as well. And then finally, up to the Skysong which is a tensile structure at the roof level, which is very light, transparent. It's permeable. It provides shade. And yet it also has a shimmering quality. And then what we feel will probably be the signature kind of statement for the project, which hopefully will travel the world in one way or another.

This is the kind of view that you would see from the western side of the boulevard. And the reason why we also feel that it is so important to build this component of the site first. You see the plaza. You see the open space. And you see the buildings behind, as opposed to seeing the buildings with a plaza behind. So this is a very important conceptual idea to us.

Now, the boulevard itself is a very different type of open space to the plaza. This is where one would meander along, one would look at the retail, one would hopefully enjoy coffee. There would be restaurants. There could be side-walk cafes and this is looking through at the main entrance to one of the two office buildings. You see that the paving continues across the boulevard. There will be a speed table so the traffic will be slowed down at that point. People will be able to cross. Pedestrians will have the right-of-way. And we really are searching here for a very active place.

The office building, the office and research component sits back from this retail lower level. You can see in this image here, the beige color on the top three levels above ground floor. That is setback 15-feet so it's not immediately perceptible from the ground level. So your experience as a pedestrian would be this 20-feet high retail base sandstone red color and the height, the overall height, the 60-foot height would recede beyond that into the background.

Now, in the first phase it's really the idea of the plaza, which you could think of as an outdoor room. It's surrounded by the cut-outs into the building with this really dominate blue colored walls. And then the interlocking of that space with the boulevard. And how these two come together is what we really feel gives the life and vitality to this place and creates the sense of public life. The experience along the boulevard has been very critical to our thinking. And as I've mentioned, although these are very quiet buildings, it's really in how you experience them as an individual walking along the street that we

really tried to pick up on. And to this end, the proportions of the buildings have been very important. When you're walking, if you could imagine, within the inner blue rectangle, you have the 20-foot high buildings on either side. There is a 100-foot right-of-way. It's a very friendly, very low scale environment that you are in.

Secondly, the larger blue rectangle is a 60-foot high dimension. It's a slightly more, you could say civic quality. It is framed by Skysong and it provides another layering of that urban space.

And then finally, the red rectangle, which is a much more civically commercial plaza, it's larger, and it's in keeping with the kind of space one would think is significant in the City of Scottsdale as a people's place.

Now the plaza has been very carefully considered to be not just the intersection of two streets. Center Street will be a fully active street because it finally would give way to the structured parking lots. And of course the boulevard would have a fair amount of vehicular traffic. So we've designed the intersection of these two roads to be paved across the -- completely across the street. And for their to be a speed table so that what this really means is that when you are on the street at the intersection, you are at the same level as the curb. You can wander right across. And we've dealt with the ADA requirements through early warning detectors and details which would enable people not to cross and be endangered by the vehicles. But this small gesture we feel ties together the four smaller components -- there's four square plazas and binds them, in future phases, into one overall space.

At the bottom of this image you see two views. The one on the left is Paley Park in New York, which many of you might be familiar with. It's what many people refer to as a pocket park. It's a very successful park. There are loose chairs so you can move the chairs around and put them in the shade as the sun moves across the sky. It's really informal and you have the sound of the water. And we haven't tried to copy that or emulate that in any way, but we've taken some of those ideas and captured them and tried to represent them in another way on this site.

And the image on the right would be our plaza with its backdrop of a similar kind of a water wall which would be viewed not only from the outside, from the plaza, but also from inside of the building. When you enter a restaurant, you would be able to see directly through this wall of water into the plaza. So it could be a really exciting space on both sides and we're hoping that we can find a way to make that work.

The plaza is the place where we hope people are going to sit and eat and have coffee and it's shaded, yes, but it's not shaded in the same way as the Boulevard. Here we envision a more permeable, removable type of informality where there would be umbrellas. There would be tables which could be moved around and we could cluster them in different way depending on how people like to group. So it provides another kind of an opportunity for public interaction. And this view gives some idea of the types of tables and chairs and how they would interact with the palm trees.

And then at the bottom of the slide some views of similar kinds of urban spaces where there has been some other kind of successful approach to space making.

The view on the right is in Prague. It's a city square. And it gives you some idea of how umbrellas can be clustered together to create shade when required. And the view on the left is our plaza with some umbrellas and we hope that at times of the day when there is a requirement for shade, the umbrellas can be moved around in a similar fashion.

Now as I mentioned previously, the dimensions of the boulevard were very critical. I'm not sure why this slide is here. This seems to be in the wrong place, but I'll move fairly quickly through this. This shows you the dimension into the boulevard and the setback of the retail, 15-feet as I mentioned earlier, back from the facade, from the face of the base of the building. And it gives you a sense, in the images on the left hand side, of how you might experience it as a pedestrian moving along the side of the building. The building opens out and recedes and contracts with some small niches, so it's not just one monotonous line of building, but there's a lot of variety on either side. And in these recesses are the opportunities for smaller gathering places and a variety of different types of experiences. So it's not just one type of sidewalk experience.

Here you get some idea of the heights and the dimensioning of that retail and the way that the canopy at the entrance to the buildings projects out to give it some articulation. And very importantly, the use of the local sandstone red at the base.

The landscape treatment along the boulevard was very important and we feel quite privileged to have ten landscape architects who have a very good thorough knowledge of the local conditions. And we will have to select the tree very carefully. It's most likely a Ficus, which can survive under the shade cloth of the tensile structure that we call Skysong. And in the recessed niches you see a smaller tree, which would give a more pedestrian feel to the environment. And then along the intersections of the central plaza there's a larger more informal arrangement of trees; it's not so structured and not so orderly.

As one moves up and through the building, this is the -- at the base level of the building, you can see the pink area is what we would see as being retail in the first and second phases. A fair amount of retail; at least 30,000 square feet in each building so that there would be this direct interface between the building and the public realm at the ground floor. And then the blue is what we would see as office and research components, leading up through the building, the typical office level.

As I mentioned earlier, we've really been very economical with the lease spans and the way that the cores and the buildings have been detailed to provide for what we think is an extremely efficient, a very flexible research and office building.

And as one moves up the, the elements of Skysong, of the tensile structure become very much more apparent in how they interface with the building. We feel will provide for a very exciting upper level interconnectivity.

Now the materials that we have selected, and there are some material samples in the front and also some smaller pieces which we could pass around if anybody would like to see them in more detail. We've chosen the very rich natural colors at the base of the building: the Sunburst and Buckskin, which are a red, dark red and a yellow, which also happen to be ASU's colors, but we also like them independently. We feel they are very vibrant.

And as we move up through the building and where the office buildings recess back beyond the 15-feet, the buildings are quieter, they're more dignified, if you will. And there we've used beiges and lighter colors and of course, the blue accent at the plaza corners.

Now, there's been some discussion about how the details would be between the blue and the beige colors at the corners, and this detail gives some idea about what we're thinking as to the way that the materials could be separated with a little recessed form at the corner, which would be about one-inch in diameter, to make sure that there is this very clean interface.

We also are suggesting some possible scoring of the stucco material at the upper levels, as you see in this detail. Now, the materials come together in the overall environment, as you see in this image.

Skysong itself is very important. And the material for Skysong again is on the table if anyone would like to look at it in more detail. We feel that it is a very special material. It's an FTPE vinyl fabric which is coated in glass. It has a very long life span. I don't go into a lot of detail here technically, but it has been used elsewhere with excellent results. And we feel that it has a durability and the life that is really required for a project of this nature. And from esthetic point of view, it has this luminosity in the shimmering quality, which I think could be very magical within the space.

Now, there has been some questioning of whether it's practical. Just to give you some idea of some other practical projects which have actually been implemented, which are far more complex and of course a different scale and different locations, but just to show you that, although we are being innovative and the design is something very new and it hasn't been used elsewhere, the technology has been proven. And I think these slides do demonstrate that. There is one in the United States: Denver Airport has used a similar kind of fabric. It was built in the early 70's. It's still there. And the Olympic Stadium in Berlin has used a similar mesh, an open mesh, with very successful results. So we feel pretty confident about getting Skysong right.

Just to lastly leave you with an image. This is the view of the spaces that connect and create what we feel is probably the most important part of this project, and hopefully what we'll be left with at the end of the day, the public space and the public place for citizens, for people of Scottsdale and for the Community at large. And I'd also like to invite you to take a look at the model at the appropriate time. And to really look in and be able to understand what it would feel like to be in this place. So, with that, if I could say that I hope that in the very near future this will become a reality. Thank you very much.

BOARD MEMBER D'ANDREA: Georgia, I just want to thank all of you guys on your team for bringing this project by. It's obvious that a lot of hard work and time and effort went into it. Question that strikes me from an architectural side is that you said a bunch of words. I'm just going to read these words to you: innovation, technology, new, social vitality, landmark project, demonstration of quality. My initial reaction to the project is that you know, the tensile structure is something that's very attractive, but I guess what I'd like to know is, if taken away, what do the other two buildings present in terms of lining up with those words that say innovative, that say new, that say fresh?

You know you guys mentioned competition being other projects here locally and I would challenge to say that the competition on this project should be the world because we're getting some world-class architects coming here to Scottsdale, doing projects. And I want to be sure that if I closed my eyes and don't see the tensile structure, I don't see buildings that do that. And I think it's going to set a tone and a precedence for the rest of the site so I'd like you guys to address that if you would please.

MR. SAMUELS: Let me address that first, if you will. I have been having, over the past month or two, conversations with the larger fabricators and builders of these kind of tensile structures. And those conversations have gone very, very well. We are presenting this proposal to you today with Skysong being an integral part of it. And we are confident that Skysong can and will be built and can be done so efficiently. And can be done in a way that is maintainable and will be with us for many, many years to come. So I say that as in introduction, because we believe strongly in Skysong. We feel that it will be there. If Skysong does not happen, then the design of the buildings will need to be changed.

BOARD MEMBER D'ANDREA: Well, just and I appreciate that. That's important to know. But I guess what I would ask is, you know, we have such a powerful structural element in the center of this thing and can you just speak to how it relates to the two buildings on either end of it? I guess what I'm having trouble with is seeing a synergy -- you know, the boulevard and the space you've created there certainly is, you know, a very nice place and I think it will be used from pedestrians. But synergy with the architecture, you know, I see three different elements there not one, so to speak. And I'm just wondering, you know, what that does in terms of setting a precedent for the next two or three buildings that will come?

MR. SAMUELS: I think that's a very good question. I'm going to let Georgia talk about this too, but I also want to be clear about something: Our intention from the beginning was that the architecture of the entire development would not be uniform. That the architectural -- each individual building would have its own life and its own shape and its own style, that if you built 1.2 million square feet of development and it was all the same, it couldn't possibly meet the needs of everyone. And having said that, the relationship of the buildings to one another and the relationship of the buildings to Skysong is set in the development framework plan, the zoning framework plan that we began with. And it is set with the idea -- Georgia talked about the outside space of the square as being a room, an outdoor room. And I talked about the boulevard as being a public realm, that's devoid, that's created by the buildings. So our intention was to use Skysong as a spine, as a unifying element and to use the framework plan to place the buildings carefully around it so that Skysong would in-fact, and the boulevard would in-fact, and the three open spaces in fact, would be the unifying elements that brought it together. Did you want to add to that?

MS. ASARCON: Yeah, and I think you've articulated it very well. Our thinking has always been that there is this very strong relationship between Skysong and the buildings, from day one. Yes, they don't look similar. They are very different types of technologies and that facet has never really been an issue because we're conceptualizing this huge site, 1.2 million square feet, as a piece of City. And in-fact, we're encouraging that type of variety because it then really is a truly urban environment and it is another district of the City, as opposed to trying to incorporate elements which

are similar and which create a palette of materials. So that was part of our thinking. And that is really the way that we have conceptualized it.

STEVEN EVANS: I'm Steve Evans and I'm a trustee of the ASU Foundation. I didn't want to make this into a history lesson, but one of the key elements of this, you'll recall we researched a hundred of these facilities around the country -- around the world, and selected three aspirational targets. One of them is a refitted Guinness brewery in Dublin that's 300 years old. It is the program that goes on here that is critical to the success of this portal and to the success of southern Scottsdale. The purpose of this is something not done in typical research parks which tend to be silohed (phonetic). The whole idea here is to draw people out of these buildings, into the public realm, so that we encourage this interactivity, which is where the innovation comes from. So, that is the task here. To create the common spaces. Yet you can see that puts us at a dilemma because many of the things these companies and people are working on are proprietary. So how do you maintain a strong sense of security when they go in their door, but how do you draw them out so that they're going to the boulevard, they are interacting with others with academic? Remember, ASU, in this first building is putting 80,000 square feet of its key facilities, that we want to be interacting with the companies that are going to populate the center. So, I think they've done a really good job of getting people to the common spaces, which I think plays right into what Scottsdale's trying to accomplish, which is to replace the vibrant public heart of southern Scottsdale. So, think program and people interacting within the space that they've created.

MS. ASARCON: Just to add one more point to that question. If you imagine that Skysong is a piece of art, you don't also want to detract from that. You want it -- it's like hanging a very beautiful painting on the wall and everything else is kind of in the background to accentuate that. So if you have too many competing elements that are all fighting to be heard with a very loud voice, often that actually dilutes everything down ultimately.

BOARD MEMBER JONES: Well I guess I'd like to just tell you back what I think I'm hearing. Many of the key elements of the plan and of course the general plan and the general idea of the project's already been approved and I don't think we need to go back over that. But one of the key elements was the way this project would address the intersection of Scottsdale and McDowell roads, which is about 800 feet from these first buildings. These are two buildings off in a field. Once we get there, if you drive down the space in between them, you get a good look at the Skysong. But if you're driving by, you see these other facades, which we've heard are quiet and respond to market forces and are dignified, they're actually just boring. They're very plain. They're very light. The other buildings like this in Scottsdale right now are hospitals. And it's a little bit of a disappointment. We were all excited that this would be highly studied, that this was going to be great architecture. And I guess my reaction is that it takes some more development.

The mesh fabric itself, I wish we had some pictures of the light quality under the mesh. It's an interesting idea because it's a softer light. Under a lot of conditions though, it's a diffused light. It's less directional. And I'm concerned that we're going to have this rather hazy light. We're talking about an outdoor room, but you know, there's cars driving in my room. It's not the same as a real plaza. So as an organizational sort of thing, ultimately I think it could come together and be a good project. It's very, very important to the City. I think we're all eager to find a way to help this go ahead. But I'm

quite sure I'm not the only one that feels that these buildings need to more than just a reserve background for this large tent structure.

COUNCILMAN OSTERMAN: I have one concern that's been expressed to me, actually several times now in emails and face-to-face conversations. Georgia, you were mentioning that the Skysong was going to be kind of an innovation that you envisioned traveling the world. I'm sure you've heard about now about the infamous monsoon season that we have here in Arizona. And there's a concern about the durability of the Skysong and you know, just how much abuse can it really take. And I mean we wouldn't want to see this beautiful innovation literally travel the world in July or August, so could you speak to that a little bit?

MR. SAMUELS: I think I should answer that, Councilman, because I've actually been having the conversations directly with the builders and contractors and suppliers of this material. I cross-examined one of the companies quite a bit on these topics of durability, maintenance, cleaning, standing up to the wind and the rain and all of that, particularly in a climate like this climate here. When asked, well what is the warranty period on the material? The answer to that was between 25 and 35 years. So it is a very strong, durable fiber. When asked about the ability for the fabric to stand up to wind and to stand up to heavy rain, I got a long and rather detailed answer about how the system has a self-guttering edge to it, and how it dealt with rain and how it dealt with wind. And I can only tell you that the images that we have put up are real images, they're in place and they've been in place for a long time. And we have confidence that this material is sustainable.

COMMISSIONER STEINBERG: Tom, will the Skysong ornament be light at night?

MR. SAMUELS: Well, I'm -- Georgia was going to mention this when we put up those images of a similar tensile structure. We believe yes, that Skysong will be light at night. What was very interesting about and we can show you some hard copy of those images if you like, is that because of the nature of the fabric, it can be light from below, and the fabric does glow, but there's no light pollution source that comes from it. It's a very interesting kind of material.

COMMISSIONER STEINBERG: Will the City require that these structures be sprinklered? Is that an aspect you have to incorporate into the structure or would it be a visible aspect of this component?

MR. SAMUELS: We have not discussed that with the City.

COMMISSIONER STEINBERG: Okay. I had another question concerning uniformity. Will these buildings set the tone from the design guideline criteria for the entire project, meaning the pallet of materials, the colors, the shapes, the textures?

MR. SAMUELS: There are two aspects of design guidelines. Some of the design guidelines have already been established in the zoning. For instance, the 60-foot height limitation, the retail setback and that kind of thing. And they are already established and will be consistent throughout the development.

Pei Cobb Freed has been asked to and is in the process of developing design guidelines for the entire center and they will be the master conscience of the design, but along with

you folks. However, it is not our intention that all of these buildings be similar, either in material or in color or in approach.

COMMISSIONER STEINBERG: So why would these first phase buildings be mirror images of each other? Why would the south elevation of the north building be the same elevation as the north elevation of the south building when you should be more contextual based on solar orientation and massing and modeling?

MR. SAMUELS: I'm going to let Georgia also speak to that, but we felt and as you know, this site has been vacant a long time. Nobody believes you're ever going to build anything in Scottsdale until you actually build it. There's a sort of a credibility issue all caught up in this development. And what we felt and what our brokers felt and really what Pei Cobb felt, was that we needed to come out of the box with a scale of development that hung together and was consistent and sent this message of size and you know, credibility. So this was a critical mass issue that led us in that direction.

MS. ASARCON: Yes, I think that's absolutely right. I think once one has a critical mass on the site, it became less important as to what the buildings are and how they relate to each other. And one would then encourage more variety. But at the outset, with very limited means, with a very small amount of gross square footage, you have to maximize on creating that first image. So I think the power of having more similarity and having less contrast kind of worked for us. And we did gravitate backwards and forwards between similar, less similar, different. And this is what ultimately we thought would be most successful because of the limited amount of building form at the first instance.

COMMISSIONER STEINBERG: Georgia, have you tried in your prior studies to integrate the focal point, which the stips call ornament?. I mean, I hate ornament, but it's their word, not mine. But have you ever tried in your prior schemes to integrate that predominant focal point, that icon, into the architecture so it flows as opposed to being free standing and isolated from the architecture?

MS. ASARCON: From a structural and a build-able point of view, we've always thought about it as being separate, because there's a lot of complexity with integrating a tensile structure with the rigid form of concrete and a beta which hasn't got that amount of movement. So this was the most efficient and the best way to do it from a practical and construct-ability point of view. And also because the buildings and the Skysong form are quite different, we felt that philosophically a separation of elements rather than trying to mix them and glue them together when they're all very different, seemed like the best methodology to use.

COMMISSIONER STEINBERG: Okay, thank you.

BOARD MEMBER SCHMITT: I'd just like to get -- some of my comments on this, I guess is, I think there's a lot to like about the project you presented. The site development and the people spaces that you've proposed on the ground level, the retail and the whole pedestrian interaction I think is really going to be exciting and a key part of the project.

The concerns that I have, I guess, sort of echo some of the things that we've already heard talked about. But the expectations for this project, and what they will do or not do to revitalize this area of downtown or south Scottsdale essentially, are huge. And I do

have the concern that the architecture, while good, and in my estimation would be well received in a business park like Perimeter Center or something like that, it's not remarkable. And I think, in my estimation, it would have to be remarkable architecture to do what it needs to do for south Scottsdale and that revitalization effort. And so I think that it's important that the Phase I architecture set a tone, sets an expectation for what's going to happen in the future, what follows this out along McDowell Road and along Scottsdale Road.

And I have feeling that by doing a project this good and not remarkable on the interior will just simply encourage similar work to follow that on the outside of the project and I think that would be disastrous. So, understanding the economics of these things too, and you talked about market forces and all of that. You look at the development standards that you have to work with and they're very generous. You've got a .8 FAR to work with. Most people don't have that luxury. And the City is participating heavily in the project. So you've got a lot of things working in the favor that would allow you to produce a remarkable project that also works in the marketplace, in my opinion.

So, my point is I guess, I think we're still missing an opportunity to set a tone with the architecture that will drive the rest of the project to be just as exciting as the people space that you've provided down here on the first floor of this project.

BOARD MEMBER O'NEILL: There might be a pattern of comments that's continuing to come out here. And I share most of them and have a few of my own. Again, one of the things I've thought about is we've talked about having a signature project and I believe are seeing a signature element. And I think there's a difference, in my view, of understanding this is just Phase I, but that we have a very strong signature element and not necessarily a strong project.

The thought of art and the fact that we have this art piece of Skysong and that we don't want to detract from that is important. I, in my own mind though also think that beautiful art is hung in beautiful buildings. And what we have here are things that are kind of going against each other, I believe.

I also think about not necessarily traveling through this space, but for the period of time that we're going to have people traveling around this space, what they see, I too agree will be buildings that look like they could be in any office park around the City. And don't believe that that is what we were expecting. Specific to that though, it's been mentioned to me, and I do agree with it and support it, which is somewhat contradictory to what I just said, is that also the details of this building with regard to how connections are made and how this architecture is going to come together, is very important.

And it's my understanding, I'm not very familiar with Harry Cobb's work, but that his attention to detail and attention to how things come together is very, very well done. And that even with the simplest of forms and shapes, that if those forms and shapes are brought together with very, very good details, that that also can be a signature and a signature part of architecture. And I'm personally struggling a little bit with that because, I mean, I am very much someone that believes in simplicity in architecture where it is appropriate and that the details are where that can be done very well. The future phases of the project, I understand and I think we've talked about how there's going to be these different elements and that each of these pieces of architecture are going to be unique in the future and agree that that's an important part of this. I'm trying to imagine

though the flow, knowing that I believe we're setting a precedent that, at least to the first two buildings are mirror images of each other, that at least what I'm -- I'm not sure where the next phase is going to be. To me it seems naturally it's probably just to the west of these two buildings down the boulevard, but maybe it's not. And/or even if that's the last phase, that when that phase is built, I mean, my mind goes that those naturally, specifically to the courtyard area that we're creating with those blue walls, will need to be mirrored on the other side to really -- need to be might be too strong, but that it would make sense for them to be mirrored in some way on the other side for that space to really come to closure. I mean, if you're calling that kind of the inside of this cube and you have these blue walls, to me it stands to reason that the other side of that would be very similar, which just again creates a concern for me thinking that this architecture that we think is falling a little bit short and we're depending on Skysong and depending on future buildings that also the market will be able to, because they'll be more design built driven by the clients and that that is going to drive, you know, a higher level of architecture and design. I understand and I think agree with that, but I'm still concerned that the phase immediately west of this, whenever that comes along, will be a continuation of what we're seeing here. So a couple of specific questions: Is it planned that Skysong will continue to travel west across the boulevard?

MR. SAMUELS: Skysong will run all of the way, east to west.

BOARD MEMBER O'NEILL: Okay. And then the warranty on that, we've heard, you know, the specifics of the warranty and it was 25 to 35 years. Is it 25 or is it 35?

MR. SAMUELS: Well, I didn't drill down into this because I didn't want to be negotiating the price. I'm sure that that comment means the product comes with a 25-year warranty and if you want a 35-year warranty you know, it costs so much more.

BOARD MEMBER O'NEILL: Yeah, and I think from a warranty standpoint, a 25-year warranty is something that would be suitable. But I think the idea of warranty -- the issue is, well we don't want to have to call on that warranty. We don't warranty because of the issues with monsoons or failure or anything else. I mean, we don't want to be depending on the warranty, we want to make sure that it is what it's supposed to be. And I actually, personally have all of the confidence that you and your team are doing the research because you're more liable for it than we are. It's got to be incredibly important to you guys. So I have that faith that that will be done.

Another specific question: The posts for Skysong, are they -- in our materials it appears that they are white or silver and they're kind of a gold-ish brassy color in the model. Has it been determined what the color of the posts will be?

MR. SAMUELS: A final determination of that has not been made, but what is being suggested by the architects is a color which is more neutral rather than more bright. And so, that sort of warm tone, gray tone that you're seeing is what is being considered at this point. But it certainly has not -- that aspect has not been finalized at this moment.

BOARD MEMBER O'NEILL: Is that, maybe this is a technical question then: Are we being asked to give a recommendation to the City Council based on a specific color or -- typically we would -- this is a little unusual because typically we don't give a recommendation to City Council, but when we vote on something we would be very clear

on specifically colors; what a color is. And I guess I'm hearing that we don't quite know what the color will be?

MR. SAMUELS: If asked, if the Development Review Board was asking whether we were proposing a specific color and whether you wanted to make a recommendation on that color or not, the answer is yes. And there is a sample of that color in the box there. I believe this is a process. And as we begin to tweak the design, then the process will evolve a little bit, but there is a proposed color for it.

BOARD MEMBER O'NEILL: Of the post?

MS. ASARCON: Yes, you'll see it in -- the materials box is on the table and that has all of the suggested colors and materials. And there are some separate pieces which we can hand around, but unfortunately, not an extra one of the paint color for Skysong. But that gray and neutral tone has been selected by Harry Cobb. And as Tom has said, that is our current thinking but you know, we would like to have some flexibility to sort of reconsider it, if need be.

BOARD MEMBER O'NEILL: Is the color of the material in the model and in our materials, I had been led to believe it was white. The sample we're showing is not that. Which is it?

MR. SAMUELS: The color of the material, when it is in place after a few months is white. The color of the material as you buy it from the manufacturer is kind of a tan color. It's coated with a material. This is Teflon coated fiberglass and that is coated with a material that when exposed to ultraviolet rays, turns white.

MS. ASARCON: And we understand that it would about, apparently about one to two months to bleach white. So the color that you see on the table is a natural color. The piece in the box is what it bleaches to.

COUNCILMAN OSTERMAN: Speaking of the colors on the table, is there any chance that we could those samples out so that everybody up here could see it? And I really hate to increase your workload or add extra time to this, but if we could get the representation of the buildings back up on the screen again and you could show us, you could walk us through the different materials and colors that you have there so we can --

MR. SAMUELS: I'm appealing to our IT team. Let me go back to one of the renderings, if I can.

BOARD MEMBER O'NEILL: Just to summarize real quick, before we get too far. We see come in front of us typically things that we're asked to approve very specific things on. And the idea that we're approving on such a signature project things that have more flexibility in them, seems unusual to me. And as well as a developer that has brought things before this Board before and will bring things in front of the Board in the future. I know that I'm always asked to be very specific on what it is I'm doing. And if that's expected of me and everybody else, I would just as soon that that's what we would expect of this --

MR. SAMUELS: We are being very specific. If I've left the impression that we're not, I apologize for that. But as you know, this building -- being in the business, this building is at the design development level. As the building progresses into construction documents and the design is completed, there are changes and they will be overseen by the City staff.

BOARD MEMBER O'NEILL: That understood, I don't want to harp on this too much, but just, when those changes are made, however, they then need to come back to our Board if they're different than what we voted on. I just would assume that process would be consistent with this.

MR. SAMUELS: As far as I understand, we are presenting very specific levels of information and if we deviate from those, they'll come back to you.

MS. ASARCON: (Indiscernible -- not at a microphone)

MR. SAMUELS: Georgia, if you use that rendering you could probably relate to the different parts of the project.

COUNCILMAN OSTERMAN: Ms. Georgia, if you could grab that hand-held microphone there.

MS. ASARCON: Is it working?

COUNCILMAN OSTERMAN: Yes, it is.

MS. ASARCON: The materials that you see in this box represent from the bottom, from the base of the building, as you would move up the building towards to top, towards the Skysong structure. So at the bottom here we have two natural Arizona sandstones. The bottom one is called Sunburst. And this one is called Buckskin. This is a very rich dark red color and this is the lighter color which is used in the recesses, predominantly. So the red color is here and the lighter oaker (phonetic) color is further down in the recessed niches of the boulevard.

And then as we move up the building, we have these natural stucco colors. This beige color and then a white accent above the windows is a detail where we have a recessed shadow line and a kind of an angled detail above the windows, which is a very subtle detail. And that will be in the white color. And then these two tones over here represent the Champagne, the Talley color for the window frames. And the gray color, which is being proposed for Skysong.

[Citizen Darlene Petersen presented the material box to the audience.]

MS. ASARCON: It's quite heavy. But now they can't see it behind you.

COUNCILMAN OSTERMAN: That's all right. I'd like the audience to have an opportunity to look at it and maybe the camera can get it.

MS. ASARCON: So I think that basically, I don't know if people want me to go through it again. That's probably enough. But basically it's from the bottom from the retail base of the building up towards the top. The various tones of the sandstone color, the stucco

colors and then finally the metallic Champagne around the window frames, the non-mirrored glass, and the Skysong mesh fabric.

COUNCILMAN OSTERMAN: Thank you. And thank you Vanna, I appreciate it.
[Laughter]

MS. ASARCON: Just to get back to an earlier point, with regards to the white detailing around the windows, when we spoke earlier about the buildings being very simple, there is a lot of detailing that is not immediately apparent in the buildings. And although they are very quiet and dignified, there is a lot of thought to the very subtle shadow lines and the recesses in the moldings around windows and in the recesses, which is really the kind of quality of the work that our firm normally puts into buildings, which although can be very quiet and dignified, still have an enormous amount of thought in the actual details.

COMMISSIONER STEINBERG: Georgia, I had a quick question for Tom and Georgia. From what I recall you saying, the Skysong will be coming in front of the Planning Commission for a height variance?

MR. SAMUELS: Is that actually a variance?

MR. GAWF: No, it's not a variance. It's actually part of the process. Within the zoning code, within PCD districts, we allow monument structures to exceed the normal height.

COMMISSIONER STEINBERG: Okay.

MR. GAWF: The Promenade, the Frank Lloyd Wright --

COMMISSIONER STEINBERG: The spider.

MR. GAWF: -- it's that concept.

COMMISSIONER STEINBERG: So the heights are not being presented?

MR. GAWF: No, the heights would have to go to the Planning Commission for a recommendation. That's our process. But it's not a variance.

COMMISSIONER STEINBERG: Okay. Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER JONES: Continuing on with the materials, I was wondering how you were going to achieve the dark blue color in a fairly permanent way?

MR. SAMUELS: The plan is to have at first, an integral color in the stucco itself and then as the stucco needs to be re-colored, if it fades, to paint it or coat it.

BOARD MEMBER JONES: Have you thought about how often you'd be doing that? I have a similar installation and we're pretty much planning to re-stain about six to eight years.

MR. SAMUELS: We understand that the various edges of that square are going to fade and need to be repainted, and we've taken that into account. The alternative permanent materials seemed far less flexible to us in terms of change over time.

COUNCILMAN OSTERMAN: Okay, I think -- you have one question for staff? Go ahead.

VICE-CHAIRMAN CORTEZ: Given the fact that, I believe the majority of the Board feel there is a need for some additional architectural refinement, how do we go about ensuring that that type of further study and articulation is actually implemented?

MR. GAWF: Council Member Osterman, Members of the Board, I think there are a couple of things that we can do. And clearly as the Applicant indicated, it is a process. It's not an end point. And I think there are ways that -- checkpoints, if you will, that we could have where we come back, which is fairly typical with the large DRB cases, where we come back and check-in with the DRB, use you as the sounding Board, and ensure that the details -- and as Board Member O'Neill indicated, the devil is in the details with this. And that's the reputation of this particular architect, is attention to details. And so I think there is a way that we can set it up and ensure that the DRB is involved in reviewing and approving those details.

VICE-CHAIRMAN CORTEZ: And Mr. Gawf, you specifically are addressing Phases I and II? That's currently --

MR. GAWF: I am.

VICE-CHAIRMAN CORTEZ: Okay.

MR. GAWF: Now in the future phases, you'll be involved again from day one through the building and in each phase you may decide which process you want, but I'm really talking about Phase I and II. And even at that, you know, there are two buildings there that you can look at. At least during the public hearing let me put together some thoughts on some checkpoints that might work and give some comfort to the DRB as we move forward with this project, if I might, Vice-Chair.

COUNCILMAN OSTERMAN: Okay, I think we're done with that portion. We're ready to move on to public comments now. Because of the number of cards I have on this item and also on a couple of the items after this, we are going to be trying to adhere as closely as possible to the three minute rule. For that reason I have the timer activated for your benefit. And I ask everybody to please keep in mind that we're primarily interested in design, Development Review Board. And so try to focus on design issues as much as possible in your comments. Our first speaker is Darlene Petersen, followed by Dean Sheppard.

DARLENE PETERSEN: Darlene Petersen. Have lived half a mile from Los Arcos for 45 -- 47 years in the same house. Councilman Osterman and Members of the Board, I have to say that we -- I'm not going to beat a dead horse of what could have been, but we expected something very unique coming in. When I showed people this drawing with the Los Arcos hidden, they said -- I said: What is it? And they said: A hotel? A parking garage? A hospital? A prison? What is it? And I said: Well, it's our new buildings at Los Arcos. Well one thing I'm glad that they brought a model. I'd certainly hate to think

that I had to help build another model like we did for the arena. That's sort of -- the model filled the Civic Center One lobby. My daughters, my grand-daughters, 6 and 9 could have built this, could have designed this. This is not unique. It is hidden. At least it's back. But then we worry about Hodge podge lodge coming around the rest of the area.

There's another question you need to ask about the art in the middle. We have terrible dust storms followed by rain. Or we have rain, followed by dust storms. Who's going to clean them? Are they going to look like our cars after one day in a storm? Just awful. Who's responsible for cleaning them? If you take away the art in the middle, you have two just plain office buildings. Nothing more. Nothing less. We expected better. One of the things that I noticed at all of the meetings of the Ad Hoc Committee, was they wanted a view from Scottsdale Road and McDowell, looking in. Well, I'm sure it's probably too late to move these buildings, but I expect due diligence when the rest of the buildings come on line, that you make sure that they look good and nice. As good as if they were put on the north part of our City. We deserve better. Thank you.

COUNCILMAN OSTERMAN: Thank you. Our next speaker, Dean Sheppard. And Dean will be followed by Marilyn Armstrong.

DEAN SHEPPARD: Councilman Osterman, Members of the Board, my name is Dean Sheppard. I am the Director of Economic Development for the Scottsdale Chamber. What we have here is an opportunity to move this project forward. And what we have are not just bricks and mortar, but we have an opportunity to create a catalyst. This center has already done that in the rejuvenation of the community. The Senior Center has also done that with other opportunities. And we see this as a way of moving south Scottsdale to be the premiere center, the epicenter for the entire metropolitan area in new innovation in technology. This is our opportunity to create our Goggles, our E-bay's and other such innovative companies that will foster here at the innovation center. So, our point is that we would like to see this project move forward. Obviously there's a lot of public opinion, a lot of personal opinion, but we see this as a catalyst and we want to remember that it's not just bricks and mortar here, it is a catalyst for the south Scottsdale and for Phoenix on a global market. Thank you.

COUNCILMAN OSTERMAN: And following Marilyn will be John Anderson.

MARILYN ARMSTRONG: Councilman Osterman, Members of the Board. I came here today thinking that I was going to speak in support of this and that hasn't changed, much. I like -- I should say first, I suppose, that I'm a 41-year resident of this area. I live about a mile and a-half northwest of the mall, old mall, former mall. This property. And I have very strong feelings about it. I like most of the articulation that the architects and the developers have come up with. I like the Skysong. I like the idea of the exterior room very much. And I like what I believe can happen here in function. And I'd like to think that function is perhaps the most important thing. But as I look at the buildings, I have to say I must agree with the Board, that there is a lack of articulation and lack of excitement. I don't know how that can be added in, but I know that it needs to be there. And I feel like I can't throw my 100 percent support behind this. I like much of what you've done. I love the idea of it being a people place. I was a member of the Ad Hoc Committee that was very much in favor of that. And I think that it has the ability to function the way we want it to, but I do believe the architecture needs articulation. I don't want worry this thing to death. I want to see it become a reality, because I know how

desperately important this is for the City of Scottsdale and for our neighborhoods and for the southern part of the City, but the architecture needs some tweaking. Thank you very much.

COUNCILMAN OSTERMAN: Thank you. And our next speaker, John Anderson. John will be followed by Rita Saunders-Hawraneck.

JOHN ANDERSON: Good afternoon, Gentlemen, Councilman Osterman, Members of the Board. My name is John Anderson. I live at 7526 East Beatrice, which is a half mile south of where this is going. I was going to ask you Gentlemen if you'd read this, but apparently, you've all read it. This kind of -- my neighbors, we went around and talked to them. I had everything from somebody saying let's just get it over with and start digging, to no way in you know what's going to come in this neighborhood. But the consensus was is pretty much what's in here. They had concerns. Of course, the Skysong was one of them. My biggest concern's that blue. I think it's too dark. But, and everybody was kind of disappointed in the buildings. That was just like you Gentlemen, they were disappointed in the buildings themselves, because they had an expectation of more. Nobody really wants to shut it down. We need it to move forward because we have had a little movement down there because of it. But I'm, like these Gentlemen said, we need to tweak this a little bit maybe, and figure out just what the overall plan is going to be. I think we're not seeing enough of this to really get an idea. And I'd like to thank you Gentlemen for listening and thank you.

COUNCILMAN OSTERMAN: Thank you very much. Rita Saunders-Hawraneck, and you will be followed by Will Bruder.

RITA SAUNDES-HAWRANECK: Councilman Osterman, Members of the Board, many of you know me. I wear two hats. I was a Member of the Ad Hoc Committee for the study of this ASU/Scottsdale Center. And I also am a Chair for the Scottsdale Coalition. I'm going to begin by saying for both positions, I'm going to echo everything that everyone has said. I worked extremely hard, as did Marilyn and many, many others, to put together the principles that we believed would be followed. Now, I will tell you that I think the architectural design of landscape is terrific. I happen to particularly like the Skysong. That's my personal take. I think the buildings look like two Wal-marts. I'm sorry and I'm ashamed of the work did not get done by Pei Cobb Freed, because the materials and the design are something that are not going to be sung about in this community. Nor are they going to bring joy and happiness. And other companies willing to go forward and explore better design concepts than are there. What you start out with is what everybody else reaches to achieve or exceed. If you're starting out with a boxcar, you might wind up with a Cadillac somewhere in the project. Or you might end up with eight boxcars. I do believe you have to look at this more closely. Thank you.

COUNCILMAN OSTERMAN: Thank you Rita. Will Bruder, and you will be followed by Joan Baron.

WILL BRUDER: Contrary to rumors in this room, I am not here to speak for this design. I am here to speak for this project in every way. The new vision of the American University, the Foundation's efforts, the meaning of south Scottsdale, is critical. I respect the Cobb Pei form. I respect Christy Tunike (phonetic) in her landscape efforts. But right now I think we all are looking for answers to how we can turn this thing around and make something happen, because again, there seems to be a universal feeling here.

And in the short time I have here, I'd like to offer three suggestions. One is, I think that for a building to look innovative, it has to have a skin that's innovative. Skin does not in any way conflict with the developer cost of the space inside, all structures and everything, but a skin speaks loads about innovation, about appropriateness, about place. Some of you have already critiqued that aspect that's not evident. The blue wall. The color doesn't bother me. The fact that we have window penetrations facing west with no shading device, bothers me. And then look at this idea of north and south and clarity, et cetera, just can't go there. I was troubled because as I, and again, I speak as a citizen of this community. I live at 3707 North Marshall Way. I'm not speaking as Will Bruder, Architect, I'm a concerned citizen. I guess I can't take that away, but you know, it's just well, territory I've been born with. But as we look at the Skysong. The Skysong, if any thing, is not big enough. The Skysong is in the wrong place. That plaza that is spoken of at this point, seems like the place we need shade, not palm trees and little umbrella tables. We would save -- or the developer would save four elements of the shading factor if they weren't down this driveway/boulevard that we're being told about. We would suddenly have a public market, a place for art fairs, a focal point, and even leaving the buildings in the place, which I don't agree with at first phase, have removed the Skysong element sculpturally to cover a great plaza in a great City, they'd have something to talk about. I heard today that the trees under the Skysong are potentially Ficus trees. We have Christy Tunike, the finest landscape architect in the west, who is a master of desert landscape, and we're putting Ficus trees in the center of a desert City? A great desert City? Again, I think we have to look at that this is just not a little makeover. We can't stop the projects for distance, I know what that's all about. I know about velocity. I know about getting it done. But I think skin. Let's look at the landscape designer bringing her best. The boulevard would be so perfect with wonderful dappled shade just like the Marshal Way Bus Station over there. You know, the wonderful grove that was put in front of the public art integration of that piece, it's heavenly. We're investing all of this and at this point, and not a revolutionary fabric structure, but one that's almost out of the catalog. Again, I walked recently at Harvard. I looked at Harry Cobb's latest buildings. They have ceramic skins of unbelievable modulation, and texture and richness. I don't see that here yet. I know they're capable of it. I know this developer is. And I know the aspirations of this University as the new American University. This is not its symbol. It has to rise to that occasion. I know together we all work towards that. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STEINBERG: Mr. Bruder, would you repeat that when the Developers come back, in some form and fashion, so they are privy to your comments, because I think they're appropriate and important.

UNIDENTIFIED: They're here. They're here.

COMMISSIONER STEINBERG: Did they all hear?

COUNCILMAN OSTERMAN: Thank you Will. Next speaker is Joan Baron, who will be followed by Michele Cohen.

JOAN BARON: Thank you, Councilman Osterman and Members of the Committee. My name is Joan Baron. I have lived in Scottsdale for last 26 years. And I am very proud to be a member of the Community, a very involved member of the Community. I am a Member of the Green Building Advisory Committee and through my education over the years as a professional artist, studying with designers and architects from all over

the world, I have come to learn and understand many things about design and architecture. And the relevance they have to one another, creating a balance and esthetic and a function. I was taught, many, many years ago by several of my professors and emphasis was always placed on form follows function. So, as a supporter of sustainability in particular, I ask myself, do these forms provide for sustainable -- a sustainable future. And that, I think, is one of the issues that has been spoken about and asked about by your Board and many of the people in the audience. I encourage and I get very excited about any project in this City that has green aspects to it. I will be a cheerleader for those projects in any way that I can. However, I agree with most of your comments and concerns and many of the audiences concerns about: Is this the best we can do? Is that reflective of what the rest of the project will be? And I have been encouraged that because we have an outstanding City staff within the Green Building management arena as well as City Planning, that they will continue to be involved at every step of this project, to ensure that we move into the highest level of LEED certification that is available to us. So, my question then, would be: Are the buildings capable of performing the function in the form that they're in in order to reach those goals? Thank you.

COUNCILMAN OSTERMAN: Next speaker is Michele Cohen, followed by Daniel Basinger.

TIM CONNOR: Councilman, Michele Cohen had to leave, so she just requested that you keep her card in the file.

COUNCILMAN OSTERMAN: Okay, thank you. Daniel, you're next, followed by our last speaker, David Hovey.

DANIEL BASINGER: My name is Daniel Basinger. And I am the Chairman of the City's Environmental Quality Advisory Board and the past Chairman of the EQAB's Green Building Advisory Committee. I first would like to congratulate the ASU Foundation as they have been responsive to the suggestions of the Ad Hoc Citizen's Advisory Working Group. In a published report, the Working Group requested that the site be designed and the buildings built to achieve LEED certification. The ASU Foundation agreed to building to LEED certification and the City wisely stipulated it in the zoning of the site. This is the largest commercial speculative development to be developed under LEED standards in the City of Scottsdale and perhaps, the State. EQAB would like to congratulate the Foundation in their commitment to achieve LEED certification. And that is about the purview of what EQAB can discuss. So, thank you all very much.

COUNCILMAN OSTERMAN: And thank you very much for all of the good work you've done for the City. I appreciate it a lot. Thanks Daniel. Okay, last speaker, David Hovey.

DAVID HOVEY: I'm David Hovey, owner of Optima and Architect for Optima Camelview Village. I believe that a new development like this should be contemporary in design and should look to the future. And I think there are a lot of nice aspects that are presented here, but I think the buildings need to be more responsive to the local conditions that we have here in Arizona. And I think the articulation and all of the perimeter of the buildings and the expression of the skin and the relationship to orientation and so forth could be richer and more diverse. So I think there are some nice possibilities. I like the fabric structure and what it could do for the pedestrian access and

so forth, but I would like to see a richer articulation of the perimeter of the buildings and more response to the local conditions that we find here. Thank you.

COUNCILMAN OSTERMAN: Thank you very much. Okay, that was our last speaker. Traditionally the Applicant has an opportunity to come back up again, or a representative.

MR. GAWF: And Council Member Osterman, I think they are here to come back. Tom Samuels, the Applicant.

TOM SAMUELS: Well, first of all, I want you all to know that we are hearing you and we are listening to you. But Georgia and I would like to take a moment to talk about the details of these facades because I think in some way they're being you know, miscommunicated by us or misunderstood by people who have seen renderings and have seen drawings and aren't really able to see the richness of the detail that is there.

Now, you may not agree with what Georgia and I have to say. And my comments are not really made to try to convince you to agree with something you don't agree to. But I would like to walk through these facades because I think this all about building skin here. And talk about what they really are. And after Georgia and I have done that, enter into some kind of a bit more of a dialogue with you concerning what your expectations are and what part of the detailing or the treatment of the buildings you would like to see us work on. And I guess I would start -- I'm going to start with the big picture of this because perhaps that has not been -- that has not been understood the best.

The first is, that the north facade of the first building and the south facade of the second building, in other words the backs, what you might think of as the backs of these buildings, when the project is built out, will be facing inward and will not really be the highlight of the project because the project is built around the parking garages and at some point, some portion of the buildings had to face those parking garages.

But nonetheless, in each case, the solar treatment of the facades is different. The solar treatment of the facades on the boulevard are the same because Skysong is providing the shading for the buildings. But on the south facade, there are sunshades. And on the north facade, there are not sunshades. So this idea of the different orientation of the building and the different treatment of the building, given the orientation, is really addressed by that.

Second of all, we've described the facades of the office building and I think that's really what we're talking about. After all, the facade of the retail is really kind of a rich mixture of sandstone and metal and glass. And I haven't heard comments that are questioning that. The comments that I am hearing from you, and perhaps I am not hearing correctly, and from others, had to do with the treatment of the office building facades themselves. And I'm not going to stand up here and say that the market economics of these buildings isn't part of our strategy, because it is. These buildings need to succeed, particularly the Phase I buildings need to succeed economically. They need to establish that people will come to this site and that this site will be important to them. That is not an excuse for bad architecture, but it is an excuse or it is a reason, an economic reason, a market driven reason that these look like office buildings and not like monuments.

But having said that, we engaged Pei Cobb Freed and we've done other buildings with them because, as many of you up there know, and I think many of the people in the audience know, that Pei Cobb Freed is historically a firm that has demonstrated its ability with buildings that are of simple form, elegant form, with great detailing. And great proportions. And that would be descriptive of the building that they did for us in Chicago. And so when I say to you, we're confident that these details will come out and will prove to be that way, I really am. And those details are already engendered in the project. And so what we're going to talk about now is some of the fundamental detailing of the wall, of the articulation of the wall, of the way the windows work and the details that may not have been immediately apparent to everyone, and I think will in-fact provide richness in the future.

MS. ASARCON: I think one of the kind of signatures, if I may say, of Harry Cobb's work is that he is an extremely understated architect. And the buildings have an extreme care with the detailing. And the way that the materials are put together. It's not something that one can immediately throw up. It takes hours and hours of careful work, of thought, of really bilious and meticulous consideration of every single inch of the building. And that is something that I think that if I can sort of stand back objectively and not sound as though I'm marketing our firm, because that's not something that we typically do, but that is kind of something that we really do have a reputation for over 30 years or so that Harry has been doing these buildings. So I feel very proud of the kind of work that we do and one thing that I really can say is that the details -- it's in the details. And that's really where our strength lies. And I feel totally confident that we are going to get it right. And that when people are in the building and when they're experiencing the skin of the building, it's going to be as good as it can get.

We didn't really walk through the details of the building and we've probably taken this a lot further than anyone would normally take it at a level of conceptual design. That's not to say that it's all totally cast in stone, but I just wanted to give you some idea of what our thinking is and how we had been considering the dimensions and the proportions and the way that the skin of the building actually works.

Many of you who are also familiar with our work will know that we have used similar kinds of proportioning in other buildings. And one in particular in Barcelona, which is a World Trade Center. It's a very big building and we've used a similar approach to having very large windows, coupled with smaller, what we call mouse holes, below the windows. And can you see this image on the screen. If you look carefully you'll see that below these large openings, which you see over here, there are also these small articulated windows directly below it, which is a fairly unusual detail, but we find that it gives a kind of a richness once you experience the building much closer.

Once you're inside the building, there's a very careful consideration of the actual heights and the dimensions and how you would look out of those openings. Plus to look from inside you have an 8-inch high building wall, then you have these what we call the mouse windows, which are approximately 20 inches. And this 20 inches is very, very critical because it actually has set the module for the entire building. It's based on a 20-inch scored detail, which is a very unusual thing to do in stucco. But one of the considerations that Harry felt was very important was to give the building a scale, a human scale. So the 20-inch module, which you see in the way that the windows have been detailed, is extended up throughout the building on this scored gore, which is a

three-quarters of an inch wide recess in the stucco. So very up close, it won't just be a sheer wall, you actually have this interesting texture in the gore dimension.

So then to get back to the windows, it's not just simply a repetitive office building module with punctured openings. There's a very careful consideration of the proportion based on a 30-foot module, center-to-center between the windows and a 10-foot wide window, which you see over here, on either side of the central member. There also, if you look very closely, you'll see that some of the windows have shadow lines and others don't. And then again there's an interplay of the dimensions of the glass. These side pieces over here are set back so that there is some relief and it's not all at one plane. So in actual fact, the shadows created will give a lot more articulation and variety in the facade. It's not all equal windows that are absolutely identical.

Above the windows, in this 20-inch dimension over here, there is a very carefully considered, and unfortunately the detail is not very big, but there's a very careful consideration of the way that that corners detail will work and the way that the plane of the concrete lentil above the window sticks back is angled into the 20-inch dimension. And it then sits back and there's a very clear shadow line that will be cast above each of those windows.

So there's a lot of richness and I don't know if many of you are familiar with this kind of level of detailing, but I'm just trying to really give you a sense of the methodology which we go through when we decide on what an opening in a wall is like. It's not an easy and a quick decision, with a lot of consideration as to the very fine dimensions.

So, I hope that that gives some idea of what we're thinking. But if there are any other specific questions on the way that we've considered the openings in the wall or the way that window sits or the glass details. If there is anything more specific I could respond to, I think that would be useful.

MR. SAMUELS: So simply put here, we have what at one level of scrutiny appears to be a fairly straightforward and uniform, perhaps boring, I think I heard those words, facade. But at the other level of scrutiny, as typical of Pei Cobb Freed's work, a certain level of complexity and detail and care of details that really is designed into this. And having heard a little bit more of this explanation, if you had questions or you had comments about the way we're treating that, we'd really like to try to address that.

COUNCILMAN OSTERMAN: Actually, I have a question. Something that was brought up concerning the western windows or the western exposure. Something about they weren't shaded. Is that -- it gets, especially in the summertime, that's -- you talk about an environmental issue.

MR. SAMUELS: That comment has been brought up. The windows, I think that are being referred to, are the windows in the notch that surround the square. When that is -- if that's what is being addressed, it is a fact that as we speak, we have not used sunshade. We were going to rely on a fairly high tech glass to do that because Harry was very interested in differentiating the way that that facade was treated as opposed to the way that the other facades were treated. But we certainly would be open to some kind of sun shading if we can't prove to the staff and to you that that is sufficient.

COUNCILMAN OSTERMAN: That's actually more your issue than mine. I'm just pointing out that in terms of heating and cooling the building --

MR. SAMUELS: We are very well aware of that. I sort of glossed over the details of the retail portion, but Georgia has pointed out to me that that's the part of the building that people will really see the most clearly. That's what they'll be exposed to. That's when people -- that's what when people make judgments about these specific buildings, and by the way, when I say these specific buildings, I mean Phase I and Phase II, because these buildings will be internal to this site. And when people look at these buildings, they will be looked at primarily from the boulevard, the east/west boulevard vantage point and that is quite different than the buildings that are surrounding them that are on Scottsdale Road, that are on McDowell, and which will be coming back to you folks, each and every one of them, for development review. But it is important and we are making a substantial investment in the detailing also along that retail facade. And so if we can find it, if technology works here, we'll talk a little bit about what we're doing there.

MS. ASARCON: Just have to bear with me. I think I have to just run through them all, Brian. Or is there a way of pulling them all up?

MR. SAMUELS: And I guess I would like, while Georgia's doing that, simply to make the point that this project is making a huge investment in the public realm, in the paving, in the landscaping, in the water walls, in the things in the public realm that give richness to the experience of people. And it is treating these first buildings as background buildings. There you go.

MS. ASARCON: I want to point to this detail because this was a very controversial detail. And in-fact, when we first presented this and we submitted to the City, they said you could never design a canopy with a point. And this was one example. This is a detail which our office has developed over many years and many projects, most recently in a building that some of you might be familiar with in France and in Paris called Tour EDF and it's an aluminum canopy, which extends out from the building, as you see over here. And the underside of this canopy detail, which we feel is very, very important, actually has a slight curve to it. It's not an easy thing to put together, but this is one example of the way in which once you interface with a building at the ground floor level, we feel that there will be an incredible amount of richness and sophistication in the detail treatment. Now what these details of course are not very easy to manage and they are not so cost effective, but we feel that at the points where it really does a big difference to the building, and where people will experience the building, this is really where we need to show good design. And of course, it might not look exactly like this once it's developed, but these are the kinds of elements which we feel give it human scale.

Now, if you look very closely, at for example, just to give you another idea of the way that we've considered the detailing, this particular resource in the building which you see here on the cursor, at this point the building only recesses back by three modules, which is equivalent to 60-inches. In every other retail recess of the building, we recess back double that dimension. So in other words, 120-inches. And the reason why we do that at this point, this is a very small gesture, but very significant we feel, to make the pedestrian understand that the entrance to the building is different to every other retail entrance. And in this case also we will extend the red sandstone back into the building, to give it that substance, to make it feel as though the building has depth and dimension.

Now again, the heights and the proportions of these elements are very carefully considered relative to the human scale. As you see over here, we have the canopy height which is 1-foot, 8-inches and then we have a dimension of approximately 16-inches to the underside of the canopy which we feel is appropriate to the 20-foot high retail base of the building. Likewise at the terrace level, which I really didn't discuss in a lot of detail, but above the retail base we have this very generous terrace, there is a coping detail rail which would have a very refined edge to the building, coupled by the base, which you see over here there's a gray base. There's a sample of it on the material board, which is renaissance stone. It's a very dark gray color with a brown texture.

So there are these details which you would only really perceive when you really start examining the building closely. And I really do feel that we've done this. You know, we've worked through it. We've developed these details. There's been quite a bit and amount of thought in it. And I think all of these details combined, and when they're really studied and analyzed, do supplement the understanding of the building in terms of the overall urban spaces and the quality of the pedestrian areas. And if there are any specific questions, for example, I mean, I don't want to sort of bore people with all of the details and go through, I'm just trying to give one or two examples so that there is an understanding of how we've put together and how we've considered these elements.

COUNCILMAN OSTERMAN: Speaking of elements, I have one more question and it gets completely away from that and it has to do with the trees that are under the shaded area. You mentioned that the plan is for Ficus trees. And I'm just wondering, do we have our native vegetation expert here today with us?

MS. ASARCON: I believe Christy, is Christy Tunike still here? I think she's unfortunately just left, but we feel she's really done a great job of incorporating local vegetation and she's really the best expert on this subject.

COUNCILMAN OSTERMAN: Well, it's too bad she left because my question is: Are there no native trees, Arizona trees, that would do as well as the Ficus under the shaded area?

MR. SAMUELS: We can certainly take the question of whether Ficus is appropriate and correct under advisement as we move forward.

COUNCILMAN OSTERMAN: Okay, thank you.

MR. SAMUELS: The point of our talking about the detail here is that, what we were hearing as a concern to you and to others, was what the quality of the building skin was. And we hear you and we are trying to express the level of thinking and the level of detail that actually exists in this skin as it is today. And does that help people? Does that explanation help people at all? Does it not? What is the feedback that you'd like to give us on that.

BOARD MEMBER O'NEILL: It helps me to understand a little bit more. It doesn't change my opinion in any way. I think when we're talking about this and even, you know, there are details, but the details we're talking about for example in the skin, even the major element of the skin is stucco. There's nothing innovative about stucco. As far as I understand, even things that you guys have talked about with regard to other

materials that Pei Cobb Freed has used on other buildings around the world, stucco is not a very innovative skin for a building.

MR. SAMUELS: This particular use of stucco in a sort of panelized form is and the choice of stucco on these particular buildings in the recessive area of the office that we're not trying to put in everybody's face, is both driven by economics and by appearances.

BOARD MEMBER JONES: Well, I think you're aware that we received a rather extensive packet and we've discussed this before and we're actually quite capable of reading the drawings and I don't think we really have much question about the details from France and so forth that are being applied to this building. But, at some point, I think we're going to make some recommendations to the City Council, and I think we're going to need to recommend that that material be reevaluated altogether.

But the fact of the matter is that even if you use something like a grid, which we've seen grids before, EIFS is associated with cheaper developer builders in this town. The facade of the building is part of the budget, maybe ten percent of the entire budget. And if you somewhat improve the quality, maybe adding two or three percent to the cost of the entire building, but somehow that is the most visible part of the building from 700 feet away on McDowell Road, you're seeing -- if for example, these first two phases are repeated going to the west, you're going to see an extent of blank plain buildings, 1000 feet long, hiding the icon. Your icon is shading cars primarily. That facade has got to be better. It's got to be darker. It's got to be a more interesting material. It's got to suggest that there was a reason that we went out of the desert to find somebody to tell us how to design our buildings.

MS. ASARCON: I just want to perhaps clarify what might be an obvious point but I think it does take a little bit of a mind shift. You're seeing these buildings out of context because these buildings are part of a 1.2 million gross square feet overall development, which is a piece of a city. It will never be -- I mean hopefully when this project really gets off the ground and it attracts other developments and things really get going, one will never perceive these buildings as sculptural object buildings. They are buildings which line streets. And it's a very -- it's not the kind of view that one will see in the long term because both of these buildings will have an adjacent structured parking garage which will be 60-feet away from them. And you'll never have that entire length of view. You'll have glimpses of views. You'll have short views threw -- down alleys and so on, but this is an unnatural advantage point that you're seeing at this point in time. And we really do have to consider it in the long term.

COMMISSIONER STEINBERG: Can I say something, Tom?

MR. SAMUELS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER STEINBERG: For the sake of time and I know everybody is kind of worn down but, this is such a very important project that we need to move along. Is there any way, to the staff, that we can approve moving this along? I don't want to see it continued. That would set us back months. And I hope I'm speaking for everybody here, but if we can just move along with certain stipulations as expressed by the public and as by our peers here on the diocese, with the understanding that we would like to work with the Higgins Team in making this a better project. Could we make that type of

stipulation and commitment so that we don't see this built in reality; that we make it better?

MR. GAWF: Yes, I think there is. I was asked right before the public hearing, by the Vice-Chair if there was some points along the way that this could be reviewed to make sure it's going in the right direction. And as I thought about it I thought about the waterfront project that I think has worked very well and what we did there. And it's a very similar process to this. And as I was looking at the stipulations at the back of your report, there a-half a dozen or so architectural stipulations that I think get at the kind of issues that you're talking about. The details that need to be refined to make sure that this is a quality project. And I would suggest that you approve them with those stipulations, with the understanding that we, as staff, would work closely with you and I know the Applicant will work closely with you on those various points.

I would add one other stipulation that we didn't include, that I think made the difference with the waterfront project. Because you know the stucco on the waterfront is EIFS, but it's done very well. And so there's different ways to treat the different materials. But you may recall that one of the conditions was that we hire an outside architect to be involved in every step of the way to make sure that the concepts work. That we understand that the concepts work and that we're checking to make sure what you and the City Council approve is actually being implemented to that detail. And so I would suggest that additional stipulation and I think incorporate in the ones that we've already proposed, with the understanding again, that the staff would work closely with the DRB on these points.

BOARD MEMBER D'ANDREA: I've just got to say, you know, personally I understand the need to speed up the project, but I think you've got too big of an issue there to go that route. And my personal opinion is that the project is of high profile. It's architecture, you know, I find it hard to believe that Harry Cobb would stand here and say that's one of his signature buildings. And not like we're requesting him to do that, but I think it's too big of a project, too high a profile, and I really wished you guys would have been in the room to hear the comments that some of the other people in the Community had because not only are they prominent designers, architects, but we heard from public and people that live and work in that area and my personal feeling on it is that there's too much there to leave to stipulations.

MS. ASARCON: Well, I wouldn't like to speak for Harry Cobb, but one thing I can say is that he has probably among the strongest ethics and values out of any architect that I've ever come across. And I think if he was here he would firmly stand up and say that this is something that our office would proudly show as something that represents the quality of our work. And he also considers very carefully the kind of work that he does take on and I think it's not only a project that is a runoff, it's also our firm that has a reputation at stake. So, with that, there's much larger ramification of what we do than one individual project.

BOARD MEMBER D'ANDREA: Sure. And just for clarification, I was definitely not addressing his ethics. I'm addressing the design of this specific project. Thank you.

WELLINGTON WRIGHT: Is it possible that I could offer one last comment? Very short.

COUNCILMAN OSTERMAN: Sure, go ahead. Thanks.

WELLINGTON WRIGHT: My name is Wellington Wright. I'm the Dean of the College of Design at ASU. And I've been tracking this project, although not following it closely on a day-to-day basis, but I'd just like to offer the following thoughts.

I have spoken with Harry on the phone a number of times about this project and whenever I have suggested that there are some concerns out there, that an adjustment might need to be made, I've seen them almost immediately in the drawings. I'm very much aware of the very talented architects in this room and the citizens who have expressed some concerns. I do believe, and I can't get involved in policy or dates, or what you can approve. I do believe that this team here before you: Georgia, and Tom and the others, are capable of making the adjustments that are required, based on what you've heard.

I talk about sustainability in the desert all of the time. It's part of my job. I think that we can get this project there. I think you've got to believe in this team. I also now understand why the buildings look the way they do to some extent. I'm actually thinking about moving a portion of my college here, and I get involved in design issues all of the time, and when presented with the option to my faculty, we are looking for space where the content is actually what's emerging from within the buildings, rather than from the exterior of the buildings. Coming from Cambridge Massachusetts, all of the high tech companies I know have moved into warehouse buildings when they could find them. They didn't want to move into highly authored architectural masterpieces, they wanted to move into places that were essentially found works and what you discovered in them was far more exciting than the exterior of the building. That in no way is an excuse for saying then, well, lets have some boring architecture. I'm not about to suggest that. But the flexibility that has to be built into buildings that can anticipate technologies and uses that we won't even know at this time, in part is what's driving these boxes, if you will, if you want to call them that, to be as accommodating as they can possibly be of new technologies, users, subdivisions, all kinds of things. But I think you've got a team here that can create that kind of atmosphere. And as Georgia pointed out, that atmosphere will be on the street. You will really not see some of the elevations of these buildings if this site builds out the way it is. If you're looking at over a million square feet, it will be the experience of that east/west boulevard that one will notice. And I think the buildings on some of those sides will really not be there for you. I think it will be the public experience that will be the most powerful on this site. So I just wanted to offer that in closing. Thank you.

COUNCILMAN OSTERMAN: Thank you. If you wouldn't mind, if you could fill out a speaker card, grab one on the end of the table so that --

BOARD MEMBER O'NEILL: I think we're getting close to and what I'll even conclude with here in a minute are what are our options. But a comment that Michael mentioned that I was going to mention as well, that to me was just interesting and I wanted to point out is this is the -- I've been on the Board the least amount of time here, about a year. It was interesting to me that this is the first time that when we came to public testimony, the development team got up and left the room. It was very disappointing. As well as the senior staff that's in charge of the project. I hope that isn't something that we see happen again on this project or other projects.

Moving past that, I as well am very interested to try to find -- because this is an unusual case in the sense that we're giving a recommendation to the City Council. When we're

not approving or not approving something today, I don't know if for example, if a continuance was the direction the Board was going, if that's an option or are we just giving a recommendation for approval or denial to the City Council? I'm not quite clear on how this works.

COUNCILMAN OSTERMAN: The DRB is the approver for this portion of the project, to the best of my knowledge. Is that correct?

MR. GAWF: The process that we have anticipated is one where the DRB would make a recommendation to the Council and because of the project, the significance of the project, the City Council would approve it or deny it -- I mean act on it.

And a couple of comments. I apologize for myself, at least, of leaving during the public comment. I think I've talked to many people on this project about it, but part of it was trying to understand where the DRB is coming from and understanding how we could address your issues in the best way.

And again, the comment that I made earlier was about the waterfront project, and it is a very high profile, signature kind of project at the main intersection of our community. And the process that I outlined earlier is one that we used for that process and I think it's worked very well. But with that, I think, again your options are to make recommendations to the City Council and if you feel you're not ready or if you feel that -- I mean, I think you have a latitude in making those recommendations.

BOARD MEMBER JONES: Just to be clear, I think that our duty here is to mention those things which we would like to recommend to City Council for their consideration and that in fact, they will make the decision on going ahead or not.

MR. GAWF: That's correct. I would also look though at the role of the DRB in the future too because as we talked about earlier, this is not a static project. This is a dynamic project that will continue to evolve. And I think it's important for the staff, as we indicated in the stipulations, but I also think it's important for the DRB to be involved in that on-going process to make sure that we have the kind of project and development that we want at this location.

COMMISSIONER STEINBERG: Could I make a motion? Are we ready for a motion?

COUNCILMAN OSTERMAN: Yeah, we are ready for a motion. But first I'd like to make some comments. It seems like we've finished up with everybody else here.

First of all, I appreciate the fact that I'm very confident that the development team will continue to work with the City Council on this and make sure we really get all of it right.

I guess I'd like to see richer articulation, but I'm actually a little more comfortable with the colors since I had that great presentation for us. I don't think the architecture is dazzling, it's not bad. It's kind of institutional in appearance from the outside, but certainly it's something that you would find in north Scottsdale or anywhere else in the City, at a minimum. I am a real strong believer that form does follow function. And for that reason, actually the entire project does hang together. It all works. It works. Actually, it works very well.

First of all, it has just a terrific signature element, like nothing else, not only in Scottsdale or in the metropolitan area anywhere in Arizona. Maybe not anywhere in the United States. It's a terrific -- I really like the Skysong a lot. I like the pedestrian walkways. I like the connectivity. I like the strategic planning, looking toward the next phases. Looking forward to the development of the Los Arcos Crossing. I like that water feature a lot. I think that really adds a tremendous amount to its uniqueness. I really also think that connecting the public gathering areas was a great idea. And once again, that has such a strategic feel to me. It makes the entire project feel like it's not static, like it's going to continue to not only grow and be alive, but to connect with other areas of the City as we continue to build.

I especially like the fact that it's being built to a LEED standard. That's very important. And I would like to point out that whether you think it should be built just to LEED standard or to the silver standard or the gold or whatever, the fact of the matter is, this is going to be the first commercial development, especially of this size, that has been built to the LEED standard in the City of Scottsdale. That's very impressive. That's the first time, number one.

Overall, here's the bottom line: I personally find this to be at a minimum, acceptable. And once again, as I expressed earlier, I believe that the development team will continue to work with the City Council to make this project stronger, once again, a little richer articulation. Maybe play with the colors a little bit. There may be a -- I would like to see a native vegetation used instead of the Ficus tree, as an example. But if that's not possible, okay. We don't want to put something underneath the Skysong that's going to die on us. But, I think that in general this is acceptable. This is a project that I don't have any problem, especially with the tweaking, see built on that corner.

I am prepared for any motion that anyone would like to render.

BOARD MEMBER JONES: Okay. Somebody has to do this.

I HEREBY MOVE THAT WE ENCOURAGE THE CONTINUATION OF THIS PROJECT, BUT WITH SERIOUS CONSIDERATION TO THE FOLLOWING FACTORS:

FIRST, THAT THE MATERIAL AND DARKNESS OR LIGHTNESS OF THE FACADE BE RE-EVALUATED.

SECOND, THAT THE AMOUNT OF REFLECTIVITY OF THE ENTIRE PROJECT BE RECONSIDERED.

NEXT, THAT THE EXPOSURE OF THE BUILDING BE RE-EVALUATED TO REDUCE OR FUTHER SHADE THE AMOUNT OF GLASS.

NEXT, THAT WE CONSIDER SHADING THE PLAZAS AND POTENTIALLY ADJUST THE LOCATION AND THE SIZE OF THE SKYSONG SO THAT IT IS A CENTRAL ICON, REMAINING A CENTER PART OF THE ENTIRE PROJECT INTO THE FUTURE RATHER THAN JUST SHADE FOR THE CARS.

AND FINALLY, THAT WE RE-EVALUATE THE INITIAL POSITION OF THE BUILDINGS SO THAT THEY HAVE A MORE IMMEDIATE EFFECT ON THE CITY.

And I suspect that some of those issues will be subtracted.

COUNCILMAN OSTERMAN: Thank you, Board Member Jones.

BOARD MEMBER D'ANDREA: Second.

COMMISSIONER STEINBERG: Could we have a little discussion first.

COUNCILMAN OSTERMAN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER STEINBERG: Could we, Jeremy, also make a stipulation that we stay involved in the so-called tweaking of this project. Could we add that, please?

(Simultaneous conversation)

BOARD MEMBER JONES: Yes --

COMMISSIONER STEINBERG: -- assured that we will arrive at a solution that's not just acceptable.

BOARD MEMBER JONES: Yes, I'd like to add:

THAT THE DRB WOULD CONTINUE TO BE INVOLVED SOMEWHAT OPTIMISTICALLY WORKING WITH THIS TALENTED TEAM. AND I ALSO FORGOT TO MENTION THAT WE WOULD LIKE TO FURTHER CONSIDER THE USE OF PARTICULARLY THE PALM TREES AND THE FICUS TREES AND DO A SOMEWHAT MORE ARIZONA CENTERED KIND OF LANDSCAPING.

COUNCILMAN OSTERMAN: Any other discussion?

BOARD MEMBER D'ANDREA: SECOND.

COUNCILMAN OSTERMAN: Okay, and the second agrees with that amendment to the motion. Kevin, do you have a question?

BOARD MEMBER O'NEILL: I am just not clear on exactly how that involvement would be. And I don't know if that needs to be spelled out any clearer or not. As I understand it, with this motion for example, if it were approved, this would move to City Council -- well the Skysong heighth moves to Planning Commission and then it moves to City Council for the entire project. And if the City Council then, with our recommendation for approval based on those issues, approves it, I believe then it's approved. For example, that if we wanted to be more involved in the articulation of the buildings or the skin or relocating elements of Skysong, that once the City Council has approved our recommendation, if they did, that it's then done. And I'm not quite sure how our involvement would be.

BOARD MEMBER JONES: I think isn't the answer, Mr. Gawf, to this, that we are making recommendations. And in fact, the City Council, as the approving body, will choose which of those items to make actual stipulations. And in fact, my feeling is we have to state our case fairly strongly, knowing full well that only some of those will

actually emerge as stipulations. But one should be that any further development of the design should return for our review.

MR. GAWF: And if I may, that's how I understood the motion, that this item would go forward to the City Council for its hearing. The DRB has identified items that they believe that should be attached to any consideration of this particular project. That's how I understand it.

COMMISSIONER STEINBERG: Do we have time to see it again? Is that what we're asking? When is it going to City Council?

MR. GAWF: It's intended to go to City Council on December 13th. So it would not come back to DRB prior to that. As I understand it, you're sending your recommendation to City Council, saying you have these concerns with this project. And one of them, one of the proposed stipulations is that the DRB would continue to stay involved in the evolution of this particular project. That's as I understand the motion.

COUNCILMAN OSTERMAN: Okay, thank you, Mr. Gawf. Any other --

BOARD MEMBER O'NEILL: Is it possible -- I just want to make sure I know what the motion possibilities are. Is it a possibility to move that this does return to this Board before it goes to the City Council or is that not an option?

COUNCILMAN OSTERMAN: No. Okay, without any further discussion, we have a motion and a second. I'm ready to call the question.

MR. GAWF: If I might, I'm sorry Council Member. As I understand it, and let me make sure because it was a little not clear at the beginning. You are sending this forward with recommendation of approval with a series of conditions that you've stated.

COUNCILMAN OSTERMAN: Correct.

BOARD MEMBER JONES: That's correct.

MR. GAWF: Okay, thank you.

COUNCILMAN OSTERMAN: Okay, once again, we have a motion and a second, and I'm calling for the question. All in favor, signify with an aye.

BOARD MEMBER JONES: Aye.

BOARD MEMBER SCHMITT: Aye.

VICE-CHAIRMAN CORTEZ: Aye.

COUNCILMAN OSTERMAN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER STEINBERG: Aye.

BOARD MEMBER D'ANDREA: Aye.

COUNCILMAN OSTERMAN: Any opposed?

BOARD MEMBER O'NEILL: Nay.

COUNCILMAN OSTERMAN: We have one opposed: Mr. O'Neill.

MR. GAWF: Thank you very much.

COUNCILMAN OSTERMAN: Thank you very much. And we'll give everybody who doesn't want to stick around for the rest of this program an opportunity to quietly step out and then we'll move on to our next item.

WHEREUPON, the meeting recessed at 3:53 p.m. and reconvened at 4:06 p.m.

[END VERBATIM RECORD]

6. 39-DR-2005 Raintree Auto Body
 Site Plan & Elevations
 15455 N. 84th Street
 Associated Architects, Architect/Designer

Greg Williams, Senior Planner, presented the case pursuant to the staff packet. Brian Johns, Architect, addressed the Board on behalf of the Applicant and indicated that he would answer any questions posed by the Board.

Board Member Jones noted that the Applicant has done quite a bit to break up the facade and reduce the scale. In response to requests for clarification by Board Member Jones, Mr. Johns explained that the front door is denoted on the site plans just in-front of the handicapped parking, on the right hand side of the canopy. The circular element is the conference room and office of the owner.

In response to inquiries by Board Member O'Neill regarding the colors, Mr. John explained that the colors on the draw-downs are not accurate. The two primary proposed colors are the lighter colors depicted in the renderings.

Board Member D'Andrea suggested that the draw-downs be redone to reflect the accurate colors so that the correct ones are contained in the file.

Board Member Jones suggested that the Applicant would ultimately be happier if the colors actually were less contrasting. He noted that the family of colors is fine and that they are related but suggested that the colors be a little deeper and a little closer.

Brandon Cavanaugh of Gust Rosenfeld, addressed the Board on behalf of Tire Exchange. Mr. Cavanaugh expressed concerns relative to fire safety.

Ms. Galav reminded the Board that each DRB case is reviewed by Fire and included with the stipulations is the fire ordinance requirements, which are included in the packet.

BOARD MEMBER JONES MOVED TO APPROVE CASE 39-DR-2005, RAINTREE AUTOBODY, WITH THE ONE STIPULATION THAT THEY CONTINUE TO FURTHER STUDY THEIR COLORS AND THAT THEY REVIEW COLORS WITH STAFF BEFORE

FINAL SELECTION. SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER D'ANDREA, THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY A VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ZERO (0).

8. 79-DR-2005 The Upton
Site Plans & Elevations
7228 E. Shoeman Lane
Will Bruder Architects, Architect/Designer

Ms. Galav introduced the case.

Robert Pazzono, Busse Gilbert, addressed the Board, citing Section 1.904 of the Planning and Zoning Ordinance. Highlights of the PowerPoint presentation included color photographs of properties surrounding the proposed project. Mr. Pazzono expressed opposition to the project, opining that the proposed design of the Upton is not compatible with the existing architectural character of the area and cited concerns relating to the context of the surrounding area.

Lynne Lagarde, 3101 N. Central, Phoenix, representing Judy Locar (phonetic), owner of the Nussbaum building. Ms. Lagarde addressed the Board, citing the Scottsdale Design Guidelines, and expressing opposition to the project based on context, use of materials, and colors. She opined that the project is not consistent with the guidelines and requested that the Board insist that the building be consistent with the guidelines.

David Hovey, Architect, owner of Optima, addressed the Board. Mr. Hovey opined that Scottsdale's Design Guidelines look to the future and expressed favor for the project.

Ms. Galav noted receipt of a letter from Michael Mahoney, developer and owner of the W Hotel. Mr. Mahoney expresses that he is in favor of this project.

Board Member Jones stated that the Board has heard and understood the arguments from the presenters and understand that it is fairly difficult because context, and even southwestern, is constantly being re-defined. He suggested that one look at the future context of this area. He stated that guidelines do not create architecture and opined that there is not a reason to stoop to the level of many of the other projects that are in the area, but rather to try to re-define what the context ought to be. Whereupon,

BOARD MEMBER JONES MOVED FOR THE APPROVAL OF 79-DR-2005, THE UPTON. SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER D'ANDREA, THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH A VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ZERO (0).

10. 92-DR-2003#2 Shurgard Storage Facility Renovation
Site Plan & Elevations
8615 E. McDowell Road
R H L Design Group, Inc., Architect/Designer

Greg Williams, Senior Planner, introduced the project pursuant to the staff packet. The City is in agreement with the Applicant's proposal and the Applicant is participating in the McDowell Street program. The Applicant has been approved for a Board of Adjustment variance for open space as well as obtaining a use permit through the Planning Commission and City Council. Staff is agreement with the property, but does not agree with the bell tower, which staff considers corporate architecture.

Shelly McTee, 11201 N Tatum, Phoenix, representing Shurgard Storage, addressed the Board.

Board Member Jones suggested that the Applicant forgo the formal presentation and instead address whether the tower can be made more of an integral part of the architecture or appropriate to the southwest.

Ms. McTee presented a brief overview of the stipulation which requests that the front elevation be revised to remove the bell tower element. Ms. McTee disagreed with staff's position that the bell tower is corporate signage, arguing that the bell tower is an entry feature which will also be utilized for some of the security equipment for the overall site.

Ms. McTee reported that the Applicant has agreed to make some changes to the bell tower, pursuant to suggestions in previous conversations with Board Member Jones.

Ms. McTee further noted that the commercial design guidelines for the area discourage corporate signage, but certainly do not say that corporate signage is prohibited. Similarly, the guidelines also encourage renovation, lighting, landscaping, many of the features that are incorporated into the renovation of this project.

The Applicant requested that the stipulation be deleted in its entirety. As an alternative, the Applicant would accept a revision requiring that the bell tower be more fitting to the southwest flair.

Ms. McTee also noted expressed concerns that if a subsequent tenant utilized the property for a storage facility, that the bell tower would not be appropriate for their use. The Applicant would accept an additional stipulation requiring that the Applicant remove the entry feature in the event that Shurgard vacated the site.

Board Member Schmitt noted that he does not have concerns with the tower or the vertical element, opining that the tower helps define the entry gate and adds some balance to the front elevation of the property. He noted that the Applicant's willingness to change the character of the tower would be more in keeping with the buildings that the tower is balanced against and would also contribute to removing some of the corporate identity elements, which in turn may make the tower more acceptable to staff.

Board Member O'Neill reported visiting the site and opined that the project will be an incredible improvement to the surrounding area. He noted that he does not have an issue with the tower as it exists now; however, requested clarification of the architectural character of the corporate identity. Ms. McTee reiterated that corporate signature or corporate identify are undefined terms in the zoning ordinance and the design guidelines. She noted the suggestion by Board Member Jones of using red tile on the roof and putting in some glass block, which are features that Shurgard is willing to work with. The structure could be somewhat modified to appear as a southwestern bell tower.

Mr. Williams offered to share staff's position, inquiring as to whether the Board is clear with regard to the Design Guidelines. Board Member O'Neill affirmed having a clear understanding.

In response to inquiry by Board Member Schmitt regarding the status of the tower element, Ms. McTee reported that Shurgard is working toward the installation of the bell tower at other locations, but it is not currently installed at all of the centers.

Board Member Jones noted that the concern he had about the tower is that it be a real, completed tower.

Vice-Chairman Cortez expressed concern regarding the diamond tiles on the east/west elevation and requested that a ribbon be created as established on the north elevation or that the tiles be eliminated.

Steve Bourne, addressed the prototypical nature of the tower, citing that Shurgard's corporate symbol is a lighthouse. The symbol is changed to a bell tower in this particular market. He suggested that the roofing material on the tower could be changed to simulated ceramic or clay tile. Additionally, the sides could be straightened.

Board Member Jones clarified that the Board is not pushing Spanish tile. The desire of the Board is that the tower appear as a tower rather than an image of a tower. Board Member Schmitt noted that the tower may no longer appear to be a corporate identity element and requested clarification of the need to require that the Applicant remove the element upon vacating the premises.

BOARD MEMBER SCHMITT MOVED TO APPROVE CASE 92-DR-2003#2 WITH THE EXCEPTION OF STIPULATION NUMBER 3 AND THAT THE APPLICANT BRING THE TOWER DESIGN BACK TO STAFF FOR REVIEW, MODIFYING IT IN A WAY OF MORE IN KEEPING WITH THE ARCHITECTURE OF THE BUILDING, AND LESS LIKE A CORPORATE IDENTITY ELEMENT. THE BOARD WILL TRUST THE STAFF TO MAKE THAT JUDGMENT. SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER JONES, THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH A VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ZERO (0).

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, being duly moved and seconded, the regular meeting of the Scottsdale Development Review Board adjourned at 4:53 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
A/V Tronics, Inc.